The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXI NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1920 No. 2882

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 337

EDITORIALS:

- No War With England 340
- Mr. Root's World Court 341
- The Other France 342
- Front Porching With Harding 342
- Again the Literary Censor 343

THE FARMER-LABOR CAMPAIGN. By Charles Patrick Sweeney 344

SELF-DETERMINING HAITI. IV. THE HAITIAN PEOPLE. By James Weldon Johnson 345

A NOTE ON COMEDY. By Louis Crocker 347

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 348

CORRESPONDENCE 349

BOOKS:

- Eternal Africa. By W. E. Burghardt Du Bois 350
- Short Story Art and Artifice 352
- Books in Brief 354

DRAMA:

- Triflers and Playwrights. By Ludwig Lewisohn 354

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:

- The British Labor Delegation 355

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER LEWIS S. GANNETT

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

AT this writing it appears that the explosion in Wall Street was either the act of a single criminal fanatic or the deliberate conspiracy of a group. In either case censure and denunciation must be unqualified. If it was the act of an anarchist or anarchists, its stupidity is exceeded only by its criminality. Every forward movement will suffer from the act; every reactionary force will be strengthened by it. This country will never be made over by any such means. Just when we have had the clearest illustration the world has ever witnessed of the futility of the policy of seeking to establish might and right by force, it is the saddest of commentaries that there are still men so misguided as to believe that anything can be accomplished by murder in any fashion. Bomb-throwers fortify and strengthen the system they attack. Anybody who reads history knows that nothing worth while was ever achieved this way; events all over the world are proving that only by avoiding bloodshed and violence can the world truly advance. The doctrine of reforming others and changing opinions by "force without stint" only makes the condition of humanity worse.

THAT this tragedy will have far-reaching effects in stimulating reaction in America there can be no question. It will bring the lawless Attorney-General into the foreground again and result in terrorist measures that will in turn be only too likely to produce reprisals. Directly after the occurrence it was announced that it would mean the immediate reexpulsion from the New York Legislature of the five Socialist Assemblymen who were reelected on the very day the explosion took place, by largely increased votes, over the fusionists who sought to encompass their defeat by uniting the Republicans and Democrats in their districts. Yet this rejection of men legally elected, merely because their opinions are distasteful to the Republican bosses, is the surest way to encourage those who believe in violent revolution. Speaker Sweet and his associates were warned that their act would increase the Socialist vote, and the warning has come true. A second rejection of these men may mean not five Socialists in Albany but fifteen —a sixth candidate came close to election in a district in which the Socialists have figured but slightly heretofore. The Government must and will exert its power to uphold public order, but it must not make the mistake again of suppressing opinion or forbidding its free expression. As ex-Senator Beveridge so admirably put it before the American Bar Association, ruthless suppression means giving "to proscribed words wings of fire." Above all else the Government itself must be calm and law-abiding.

ITALY is in a fair way to establish as significant a revolutionary precedent as the Russian. The workers calmly seized the metal factories, keys to the industrial power of the nation, then told the Government what they wanted, and the Government, according to the cable dispatches, is granting what they ask. Their wage demands are secondary; their primary demand is joint control of the direction of industry. And it is no mere radical fringe of the working class of Italy which makes these demands; the Catholic People's Party barely lags behind the Socialists, and the considerable anarchist group led by the veteran agitator Malatesta goes farther still. The Prime Minister himself, seventy-eight-year-old Giolitti, who in all his decades of political activity never was a Socialist or a member of the extreme Left, accepts the workers' point of view. "It is no longer possible to uphold the principle that in a great industry there must be one single chief in command," he says, "while thousands of dependents must obey with no guaranty of control over the activities of the chief himself." The Italian Parliament is to be called into special session to legalize the new status of the workers in industry, and newspaper reports indicate that the "control" which is to be put into the workers' hands will cover "the whole financial as well as technical field of industry." This is an extraordinary, astounding, and far-reaching revolution, without barricades or bloodshed, revolution aided and abetted by a Government which, though anti-Socialist, is awake to the kaleidoscopic period through which Italy and Europe are passing. How little our newspapers have prepared us to understand it!

HAITI is getting into the newspaper headlines at last, and administration officials reply to criticism by declaring that criticism is "cheap." Secretary Daniels responds to Senator Harding's charge that thousands of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Haitians have been killed by expressing surprise "that a Senator of the United States should give currency to so unjust a reflection upon the brave and patriotic members of the Marine Corps on duty in Haiti." The fact that three thousand Haitians have been killed remains, Mr. Secretary; and it is not the brave and loyal members of the Marine Corps, who obeyed orders, who will have to bear the blame, but their superiors who gave the orders. It will not do to talk about the menace of the Germans in Haiti; too much has been forced on that republic by American guns since all threat of German penetration was removed. Nor will the country be satisfied with reports by officers of the Marine Corps itself, nor even with the report of so able and honest an officer as Admiral Knapp, who, as captain of the flagship Olympia, gave the orders which dissolved the Dominican Parliament and removed the ministers of the Dominican Government. Such reports are predestined to be mere coats of whitewash. Nothing short of a bipartisan Congressional investigation will do. Meanwhile, to those who seek the facts, we commend a reading of the issues of *The Nation* for February 21, July 10 and 17, August 28, and September 4, 11, and 18.

"THE fate of Germany is in large measure in the hands of the Allied nations and the United States. . . . The policy of destruction is bound to bring interminable trouble to the rest of Europe. Putting first, as is just, the interests of France and her Allies, I believe that the best chance for the peace of the world lies in the policy of cooperation—in the Allies and the United States helping Germany to remain a united nation and to regain her prosperity." Such is the verdict of Paul D. Cravath, one of New York's ablest lawyers and one of the most intense partisans of the Allies during the war, on his return from a visit to Germany. His impressions agree with those of Ludwig Nissen, a letter from whom we print in the "Correspondence" columns of this issue. Both dwell upon the need of food, the mass undernourishment in Germany; both predict that next winter will be the worst winter for Germans; both feel that the treaty should be revised; and both believe that Germany can escape anarchy and chaos if the Allies—and that means largely America—will help her with food and raw materials. "I think," says Mr. Cravath, "the remedy against bolshevism in Germany is largely in the hands of the Allies." It is encouraging that such a sane and wholesome doctrine of international cooperation is making headway; it is to be hoped that it will leak into Paris and Washington.

THE London *Daily Herald* has refused an offer of Russian money. We congratulate it; we only wish it had not considered acceptance. And we regret profoundly that the Russians offered it. In one sense the offer might be viewed as such a friendly pledge of international solidarity as moved the German Socialists to assist when Jaurès founded *l'Humanité* in Paris; but when Britain is only half emerged from virtual war upon Soviet Russia and the Bolshevists are seeking peace the offer inevitably looked rather like a payment for service to be rendered. The very suggestion of subsidy weakens the fine service of the *Daily Herald* to the cause of European peace. The Russians, whose foreign policy toward the Baltic states, toward China, and even toward the hostile Entente Powers, has been remarkable for its enlightened generosity, seem to have taken a turn toward interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. The conditions for admission of western Socialist parties to the Third Internationale instance a dictatorial attitude which will inevitably be resented by those parties and must check the growing unity of spirit which had made European labor the most potent liberal force on a reactionary continent. Absolute acceptance of all decisions of the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale is asked, strenuous centralization, active propaganda to break up the old Trade Union Internationale, disregard of bourgeois law, change of name from Socialist to Communist Party; and there are other less intrusive requirements. The split in the old labor Internationale was a tragedy caused by the abdication of the old leaders; now unity seems farther off than ever, and the blame for it must rest largely with the Bolsheviki.

WE sometimes forget that we are still at war with Germany. The Germans, however, are not permitted to forget it—it is still a crime to fly a German flag within the zone of American occupation on the Rhine. The *Frankfurter Zeitung* reprints the following notice from an administrative gazette in the American zone:

Headquarters of the American Forces in Germany.
Bureau of Civil Affairs.
Coblenz, Germany, July 6, 1920

Information for all O. C. C. A.'s.
Subject: Flying of German national flags.

1. The question of the flying of German national flags in the American occupied zone was discussed by the High Inter-Allied Rhineland Commission on June 28, 1920.

2. The legal adviser of the American forces in Germany has reached the following decision: "Until a definitive state of peace between the United States and Germany comes to pass, the flying of German national flags should be prohibited within the zone occupied under our command. In that territory our rights rule and our will is the highest law. The flag of a nation is a visible sign or symbol of government. It should be an indiscretion for any German office here, with the exception of administrative offices acting with our authorization, to fly a German national flag. There is nothing in the armistice agreement indicating such permission, and it should not be allowed.

3. The Commanding General adds the following remark: "The Germans in the occupied region should know very well that they are not permitted to fly either the old German flag or the flag of the new German republic. This must be respected in the American zone."

R. P. HALL, Acting O. C. C. A.

Comment on such bullying seems superfluous.

THE war is over and it is high time that the old facilities of passportless travel should be reestablished. Latter-day passports, being a source of revenue and an opportunity for the exercise of petty power, may last long. But it is heartening to read that R. B. Mahany, Acting Secretary of the Department of Labor, has ruled that aliens shall not be barred from this country because of religious belief or pacifist principles. A Canadian member of the pacifist International Bible Students' Association sought to enter to attend a convention of that organization in the United States; Mr. Mahany ruled that he should be admitted. "The United States was founded on the principles of both civil and religious liberty, principles which are the foundation of American government," he declared. That sounds like the good old-fashioned common sense which we used to call Americanism before the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A LETTER by Mr. Charles Nagel—which *The Nation* prints in this issue—takes exception to our position that a ballot for either Cox or Harding is wasted and that the best course for the independent in the coming election is to vote one of the minor party tickets. With Mr. Nagel's contention that the Democrats richly deserve defeat we agree unqualifiedly. But do the Republicans deserve victory? Was it not Republican reaction and failure to meet living issues that first placed and then kept Mr. Wilson in the White House? Nor have eight years of the most tremendous evolution the world has ever seen taught the Republicans anything. The same Old Guard, the same old gang, with its principles of pelf and privilege, is still in control. Harding's nomination strikingly testified to its unenlightened and unabashed effrontery. Imperative as it is to "oust the dynasty," as Mr. Nagel urges, and to relegate to obscurity Palmer and Burleson, two of the most sinister figures in our public life for a generation, is salvation any more likely under Penrose and Barnes? Is political progress in this country eternally to consist of election by disgust? Is the quadrennial expression of a sovereign people to be solely a negative registration of distrust, disappointment, and disillusionment? The time to break sharply from so hopeless an outlook is *now*, when the essential differences between the two parties have never been slighter, nor the need for new vision and new leadership more imperative. In contemplating the sham battle between the two major parties, the position of the protesting liberal has this redeeming feature: while a disinterested participant, he can rejoice heartily, should Harding win, at the defeat of the Democrats; and if Cox be elected, at the Republicans' downfall. Meanwhile, in "throwing away his vote" for Christensen or Debs, he is doing his part in bringing about a change in a system which has ceased to serve.

VARIOUS palliatives that have been suggested for relieving the housing shortage in America must apparently be rejected upon closer scrutiny. The proposal to exempt real estate mortgage interest from State and Federal taxes, for instance, is adversely criticized by the City Club of New York on what seem to be sound grounds. Since the proposal contemplates inclusion of mortgages on existing as well as on future building, and on commercial as well as residential structures, it is apparent that much revenue would be lost in return for rather unimportant assistance to only a small amount of new residential construction. John J. Murphy, formerly Tenement House Commissioner of New York City, demolishes the proposal to increase housing facilities by adding an extra story to existing five or six-floor apartment houses. Without excessive costs, he says, this would involve removing the roofs and dispossessing all tenants now occupying the top floors.

MEANWHILE professional opinion seems to be looking more and more to the government, State or municipal, to take hold of the problem. In the memorandum above quoted the City Club approves the proposal of the New York Reconstruction Commission for a constitutional amendment which would permit the State to extend its credit on a large scale at low rates to limited-dividend companies or individuals to build houses of prescribed standards and controlled rents. The City Club also backs the suggestion for an enabling act permitting cities to go into the housing business. This would give quicker relief than the slow process of constitutional amendment, while the Health Commissioner of New York City would seek even more immediate help by getting from the Legislature the right to take over all vacant housing facilities. Architects are more and more persuaded, it appears, that the profits system is no longer to be depended upon to supply the masses with homes. We quoted recently the opinion of the Philadelphia chapter of the American Institute of Architects to that effect. Mr. Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, adds his voice to this view. He proposes that cities buy tracts of land, make direct contracts with the building unions, and organize the materials business so as to cut out excess profits.

WHETHER the huge Republican majority in Maine clearly forecasts Mr. Harding's victory or not, it was a glorious victory for the Republicans, and utterly disposes of the contention that the newly-enfranchised women favor the League of Nations. The Democrats may make any excuse they please, but the fact is that the League of Nations was a controlling issue, that some of the best Democratic campaigners toured the State, and that Franklin Roosevelt was sure the women were coming over to the Democratic side. The result was a Republican majority of 66,037, and this in the face of a torrential rain. It is, of course, easy for the New York *World* to remind the Republicans that Maine went Republican in the State contest of 1916, only to vote Democratic in the presidential election. No election is won until it is won, and anything may happen between now and election day. But if ever a candidate was entitled to consider himself elected in advance, Mr. Harding is. Indeed the indications are for a rising tide, not of approval of the Republican candidate, but of intense dislike of the Democrats. There is the widest desire to express popular disapproval of Woodrow Wilson, and the men who denounce or would amend the treaty are the ones who have been winning in the recent elections. Not only is the Democratic Party destitute of organization and of driving power; it is disintegrating, as in Connecticut and Maine, or is being captured by the Nonpartisan League, as a Montana and Colorado.

A TEMPORARY injunction was granted last week by the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia forbidding officers of the United Mine Workers of America to attempt the organization of miners in the southern part of the State. According to an Associated Press dispatch, the injunction, issued on petition of various coal companies, restrains "attempts on the part of union officials to induce miners in this field to break what the companies allege is a contract of employment." Without going into the ethics of breaking a contract, it may be said unqualifiedly that an injunction to enforce a contract is a new and wholly unwarranted judicial doctrine, exceeding in its lawlessness even the decision of United States Judge A. B. Anderson in Indianapolis last winter. The established law of contracts is that in case of violation the aggrieved party may seek redress by a civil suit for damages; he has no other recourse. The order of this West Virginia tribunal, if correctly reported, is contempt of court in the widest sense, because it saps public confidence in the integrity of our whole judicial system.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No War With England

IT is because they believe that war between England and the United States would be the greatest calamity which could befall the civilized world, and because they feel that the two countries are rapidly drifting apart, that the editors of *The Nation* have invited one hundred of their fellow-citizens to form a committee to investigate, through a commission, the charges and counter-charges of atrocities in Ireland. The case of Mayor MacSwiney and the other hunger strikers has stirred this country profoundly. So conservative a newspaper as the Chicago *Tribune* declares that the "Irish situation seriously involves the United States, and the case of MacSwiney is the Irish question just now at its highest point of drama." This, the most powerful newspaper of the Middle West, declares that if MacSwiney starves to death this blunder "might conceivably affect the peace of the world." The words are ominously like those used by President McKinley and the interventionists in Cuba in 1898, who maintained that the United States could not tolerate such terrible conditions at its door.

That the procedure *The Nation* has suggested is unusual we admit. But unusual conditions call for unusual methods, and in view of the failures of governments everywhere to prevent existing wars and to establish peace, it is high time for citizens to get together to do what they can. The British labor forces have just prevented their country's going to war with Russia. On this side of the ocean it is a just charge that lovers of peace too often fail to move until it is too late—until war is actually at hand. If the proposed commission can establish the facts, so that the United States may know exactly where the truth lies, we believe that it will be so great a service in clearing the atmosphere that we shall not be disturbed by the charge of improper interference in the concerns of another nation. As a matter of fact, the concerns of every other nation, even their internal affairs, as in the case of Russia, profoundly affect the rest of the world; this, the war has once more clearly demonstrated. The editors of *The Nation* are moreover quite well aware that we live in glass houses; that we have our unsolved Negro problem; that our record in Haiti and Santo Domingo is wickedly imperialistic, and that we have done to death three thousand Haitian men, women, and children who did us no wrong. If the procedure that we are suggesting in the matter of removing one of the great causes of irritation between England and the United States is successful, we would welcome an inquiry by Englishmen, under the auspices, say, of the Labor Party, into our Caribbean venture.

With a view to constituting a non-partisan Committee of One Hundred on Ireland, *The Nation* has sent the following telegram to a list of representative Americans:

The struggle between Great Britain and Ireland which has gone on for many months with increasing use of armed force by both parties is widely reported to be accompanied by atrocities planned by British Government and answered in kind by Irish people. One grave result is rapid growth of anti-British feeling which seriously threatens unspeakable calamity of war between United States and Great Britain and endangers peace of the world. In the interest of peace and international friendship the editors of *The Nation* earnestly invite you to serve as member nonpartisan committee of representative Americans with power to add to their number who shall designate a select commission to sit at Washington or elsewhere for impartial investigation of reported atrocities in Ireland regarding which the British Ambassador and Professor De Valera and others shall be invited to submit evidence. Proposal does not contemplate any recommendations regarding future relations between Great Britain and Ireland.

Up to the time of going to press acceptances had been received as follows:

United States Senators Ashurst, Arizona; Johnson, California; Phelan, California; Spencer, Missouri; Walsh, Massachusetts.

Representatives Mason, Illinois; McArthur, Oregon; Randall, Wisconsin; Sherwood, Ohio; Voight, Wisconsin.

Governors Campbell, Arizona; Carey, Wyoming; Frazier, North Dakota.

Mayors Gillen, Newark; Hague, Jersey City; Hayes, Vicksburg, Miss.; Herman, Newport, Ky.; Hoan, Milwaukee; Marshal, St. Joseph, Mo.; McCavitt, Anaconda, Mont.; Quigley, New Britain, Conn.; Quinn, Cambridge, Mass.; Schrieber, Toledo; Smith, Omaha; Sullivan Worcester.

The President of the Board of Aldermen of New York City, F. H. LaGuardia.

The Rev. Edward C. L. Adams, Columbia, S. C.; Jane Addams, Hull House, Chicago; Judge Charles F. Amidon, U. S. District Court, Fargo, N. D.; Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, Washington, D. C.; William Harman Black, former member National War Labor Board; Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, New York City; Miss Lucy Branham, Baltimore; J. M. Budish, United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers of America; Bishop Byrne, Galveston; J. J. Castellini, Cincinnati; Parley P. Christensen, Presidential candidate Farmer-Labor Party; George W. Coleman, Boston; Martin Conboy, former Director of the Draft, New York City; Professor Horace A. Eaton, Syracuse University; Maurice F. Egan, former minister to Denmark; John L. Elliott, Hudson Guild, New York City; Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University; former Governor J. W. Folk of Missouri; Mrs. André Fouilhoux, Short Hills, N. J.; Royal W. France, New York City; Gilson Gardner, Washington, D. C.; Arthur Gleason, New York City; James H. Graham, Springfield, Ill.; Dr. Gillette Hayden, Columbus, Ohio; Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University; William Randolph Hearst, New York City; Morris Hillquit, New York City; Judge George Holmes, Omaha; the Rev. John Haynes Holmes, New York City; Richard R. Kilroy, Anaconda *Standard;* George W. Kirchwey, former Dean of the Columbia University Law School; Owen R. Lovejoy, National Child Labor Committee, New York City; Professor Robert Morss Lovett, University of Chicago; Miss Hazel MacKaye, New York City; Dudley Field Malone, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, New York City; James Maurer, Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor; Allen McCurdy, New York City; Mrs. Agnes H. Morey, Brookline, Mass.; John E. Milholland, New York City; A. P. Moore, Pittsburgh *Leader;* Mrs. William F. Murray, Catskill, N. Y.; President William A. Neilson, Smith College; Professor William A. Nitze, University of Chicago; Daniel C. O'Flaherty, Richmond; M. O'Neill, Akron, Ohio; the Rev. Watson L. Philips, Ansonia, Conn.; Captain Julius C. Peyser, Washington, D. C.; Amos Pinchot, New York City; the Rev. Levi M. Powers, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. James Rector, Columbus, Ohio; Raymond Robins, Chicago; Gilbert E. Roe, New York City; Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., New York City; the Rev. John A. Ryan, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; Professor Ferdinand Schevill, University of Chicago; Rose Schneidermann, Woman's Trade Union League; R. O. Sharon, Peoria, Ill.; Emma Steghagen, Woman's Trade Union League; Miss Doris Stevens, Croton, N. Y.; Norman Thomas, New York City; former Senator James K. Vardaman, Jackson, Miss.; Mrs. Henry Villard, New York; William Allen White, Emporia *Gazette.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Root's World Court

THE long-expected proposals for the new world court upon which Mr. Elihu Root and other distinguished personages have been working for months past, at the invitation of the League of Nations, were published last week. Let it be said at once that, defective and unsatisfactory as the plan as a whole is, it yet marks a step forward over the Hague Tribunal for Arbitration, whose existence, on its present basis, was practically terminated by the war. Every time that the nations can be got to consider that supreme court of the world, for which humanity hungers, it means an advance. It must in justice also be said that Mr. Root and his associates have worked out well the judicial machinery and forms, the method of selection of the judges and their functions, and their relation to the causes which may come before them. Those trusting persons who are willing to accept the League of Nations while recognizing its manifest faults and weaknesses, in the confiding hope that it will be possible to reform it from within, as the present Constitution of the United States succeeded the loose and weak Articles of Confederation, will doubtless hail this new court proposal as a satisfactory half-loaf.

Emphatically must it be declared, however, that this is not a real court which is being offered to us, nor one that gives adequate hope of exercising a more determining influence upon the affairs of nations than did the Hague Tribunal which is now suspended. The reason for this is simple enough. The proposed court is the creature of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and it cannot rise above the source of its existence. Article 14 of the Covenant dooms the court to innocuous desuetude by the very language which constitutes it: "The court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character *which the parties thereto submit to it.*" In other words, this court will have no jurisdiction unless all parties to a dispute consent thereto. It is without the power itself to issue a summons to contending parties or to enter an order; indeed, an American justice of the peace has today more inherent power and jurisdiction than this proposed court. And, if we turn to Article 15 of the Covenant, we find that it is there provided that "any party to a dispute may effect such submission [to the Council] by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary-General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof." That is to say, any nation which is a party to a dispute, if it decides to bring that dispute to the attention of the League at all—and it does not have to—can utterly ignore the court and by the mere giving of a notice compel a hearing of the dispute before the Council of the League. This is in accordance with the fundamental idea of the whole Covenant—that a group of four or five men in the Council shall dominate the affairs of the world.

Let us see what would happen in the case of the dispute between China and Japan over Shantung. China might call upon Japan to present the case of Shantung to the proposed court. Japan, using her undoubted rights, could bring the case automatically before the Council by simply ignoring the court and giving the required notice to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations. What, then, is the situation? In the Council Japan, in order to defeat China's just claims, need obtain only one vote, since the Council's decisions must be unanimous, and that she now possesses. Moreover, as the Council is now constituted, three permanent members of it, Italy, France, and Great Britain, are already committed to the award of Shantung to Japan. It is true that China might take her case to the Assembly, but with the dominating power of Great Britain in that Assembly there would be slight chance for her. The true supreme court of the world must be established in another way—by all the nations of the world getting together in conference and voluntarily submitting themselves and *all* their disputes, present and future, to the jurisdiction of that court. Again, we do not believe that the court which is to survive and pass upon the disputes of nations can be established solely by the chief victors in the late war.

Perhaps the very worst feature of the proposed court lies in the fact that it will be within the power of a nation, just as it is now, to determine whether a controversy is justiciable or not. Just as long as this vicious discrimination between disputes is made, just so long will any such court be powerless and the League unable to stop international conflicts. Most of the wars of the past have arisen out of so-called non-justiciable disputes. When such a quarrel arises the new court will have no power to hale one party or the other before it, and if the disputants intend to fight the matter out nothing can prevent them unless the Council of the League takes immediate cognizance and threatens the aroused nations with war and economic blockade. The likelihood of the Council's doing this in a case of so-called national honor is of the slightest.

Take the Vera Cruz incident, for instance. The United States claimed that its sacred honor was involved by the insult to its flag, and it demanded an apology which it did not receive. Our forces then attacked the inhabitants of Vera Cruz, killing 400 men, women, and children. Under the existing code of national conduct, our quarrel with Mexico was a non-justiciable dispute. The proposed court would have had no jurisdiction over it; the Council of the League which permitted Poland to undertake an aggressive war upon Russia would hardly have undertaken to dictate to the United States that it should not occupy a Mexican city to enforce its will.

That there is no mention in the plan proposed by Mr. Root of any armed force to put into effect the decrees of the court is good. It is the intention, of course, of the founders of the League to have such a force, but there are men, like Senator Knox, who believe such display will no more be necessary for the supreme court of the world than it has been for the Supreme Court of the United States.

Five great steps forward must be taken simultaneously with the creation of any court if it is to endure and play its destined role: first, the distinction between justiciable and non-justiciable disputes must be wiped out; second, the court must have power to intervene, and to intervene at all times—the proposed court is to sit only during part of the year; third, there must be immediate international disarmament as the most vital step toward safeguarding the court and the peace of the world; fourth, the careful codification of international law must be begun by a group of jurists in international conference; and, finally and most important, there must be an outlawry of war itself. We consider it a happy omen that Senator Harding has used the term "outlawry of war" in a recent speech. It is entirely as practical as was the outlawing of the duel, and like disarmament it could probably have been obtained at Paris but for the flinching of one man—Woodrow Wilson.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Other France

THERE are two Frances, as there are two Englands, and two Italys, and two Germanys—at least two. The France that speaks officially in the name of the French people today—the France of Millerand and Gouraud and Weygand and Foch, the France of bemedaled generals, and bespangled oratory, and bemuddled dreams of Napoleonic empire, the France of the Czar's bond issue and the Comité des Forges—that France has become the inheritor of the Prussian mantle. It is the hearthstone of reaction in Europe today, the nursery of counter-revolutionary conspiracies among exiled dukes and financiers, the hope of the Hungarian dictator Horthy, of the Cossack bandit-chief Wrangel, and of the Polish imperialist Dmowski; the great obstacle to European reconstruction.

That France is not the France which made the word "France" an inspiration, a symbol of high idealism, of intellectual achievement, of generous emotion, in past years. The war hushed the voice of the other France, though without silencing it; and the psychology of sudden, overwhelming victory, following years of depression and invasion, and the weary after-war spirit of *"je-m'en-fichisme,"* drowned it beneath the cacophonies of guns and drums. But Romain Rolland never abandoned his vision across and above the battle; Henri Barbusse wrote the great human epic of the war; lesser voices of no mean caliber have spoken bravely and well—Georges Duhamel, Leon Werth, Jules Romains, Marcel Martinet, and others. In these latter years Anatole France, who more truly than Clemenceau deserves the title of the grand old man of France, has reexpressed the spirit of an elder and a finer France.

Anatole France, for all the serene detachment of his Epicurean garden at Tours, dreads the ruin which the bemedaled France has wrought his country and Europe. "I am sad," he tells an interviewer. "The future of Europe is black. The only hope is internationalism, but the war has left nationalism triumphant." And in *l'Humanité* he writes pathetically:

> It is appalling to regard the position of France as she was during the war and as she is today. A hundred peoples, at the call of France, came together from the ends of the earth, to "destroy" Germany. What have we done with our Allies? What has become of our friendships? Not one is left. We have worn them all out by our proud and moody ways, by that bellicose ardor which has so surprisingly survived the long and cruel war. First America suffered our sarcasms when she brought to us a political conception different from our own—and nothing of which survives in the treaties. Then we quarreled sharply with our Latin sister. Then we alienated the states of the East. Then, exasperated by our great financial embarrassments and by the difficulty of applying an ill-made treaty, we got ourselves into more disagreements with England than the public has ever known. I do not judge the conduct of our Allies and do not bind myself to approve it. I only note that the policy of the capitalists, soldiers, and diplomats who govern us was neither adroit nor successful.
>
> Our position was difficult. The recognition of Wrangel now renders it terrible. Here we are, alone at last. For after this diplomatic coup d'etat, what remains of the Franco-British Entente? We are alone. . . .
>
> To what new dangers and unknown disasters will this course lead to which our retrograde Parliament and its reactionary government have condemned us? Are we being led into a new war with Soviet Russia? Our fears are greater because peace is not defended in France as it is in England by a working class able to make its voice heard in the councils of Empire. Labor has no influence upon our Government. And yet to assure the threatened peace, the peace which capitalists and soldiers fight and weary ignorant bourgeois betray, we can count only on the working class. . . .
>
> Today the working class holds in its hands the salvation of France, the salvation of Europe, the salvation of the world. The situation is terrible. With profound emotion, in a voice weakened by age but deepened by passion for the public good, I cry, "Frenchmen, save the peace of the world."

Anatole France's appeal goes almost unheard. The shrill, revengeful voices of Tardieu, Loucheur, and Poincaré dominate the French councils of state. Millerand has even abandoned the policy adopted at Spa of discussing reparation problems with German experts, and reverted to the policy of dictation—aided and abetted by our own State Department. Perhaps for a time we must abandon hope of finding in the political expression of France the things which have made "France" a name to conjure with. Millerand's France we must combat; but let us not forget that there is and always will be another, vastly different, nobler, more beautiful France.

Front Porching With Harding

From Our Special Correspondent at the Front (Porch)

SENATOR HARDING rose early this morning and displayed his stalwart Americanism by washing, shaving, and putting on his clothes. He then sat down to breakfast, which he ate in true democratic fashion with knife, fork, and spoon. It is little touches like this which reveal the Senator's kinship with the common people and endear him to the masses. The first appointment on the Porch was with a delegation from the Dairymen's Association of Hokamazoo, with each member of which the Senator shook hands cordially. In every instance he extended his right hand, thereby exhibiting that delicate tact which has made him so successful in his relations with men.

"I feel like one of you," the Senator said gracefully. "All my life I have eaten butter and drunk milk, and thus have gained a close personal insight into your problems and needs. One of the things this nation must do is to keep the boys and girls on the farms. In order to accomplish this, the farmer must be made prosperous and contented. Without wearying you at this moment with details, I want to say that my plan for meeting this problem is to see that the farmer gets fair prices for his produce, that the wholesaler and retailer get just compensation for distributing it, and that the consumer is able to buy at equitable prices."

Senator Harding's courageous reference to the rights of the consumer in the presence of men who were presumably interested chiefly in better prices for their products was one of those characteristic strokes of bravery which win him friends every day because of his sheer honesty and unmistakable independence. As the dairymen filed down the steps of the Porch, another delegation was already waiting to be received, but the Senator found time in between to wave his hand genially to a friend who was passing, and to say "Excuse me" to one of the dairymen whose foot he accidentally stepped on. One of the secrets of his success is that, no matter how busy, Senator Harding always finds time for little kindnesses like these.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The meeting which followed, with a committee from the Brotherhood of Railway Baggage-Smashers, brought out clearly the Senator's skill in meeting hostile criticism and in answering difficult questions fairly and squarely. "Mr. Harding," said the spokesman of the committee almost immediately, "do you believe in the union shop?"

"Our whole industrial fabric must be considered in answering that question," the Senator replied. "I do not believe in setting class against class, but in bringing all the forces of our country into cooperation. That involves the development of a general program in which the point you raise will naturally be settled along with others."

"How do you propose to lower the cost of living?"

"Ah, there you raise an acute question. We must safeguard the producer, on the one hand, and relieve the general public on the other. In a general way I favor any legislation toward that end, but would want to study the probable effect before approving a particular measure."

"He means he'll have to ask Penrose and Lodge," said somebody *sotto voce,* while another voice asked aloud: "Mr. Harding, do you believe that two and two make four?"

Here was an obvious attempt to heckle him—a crisis that demanded resourcefulness and decision—and Senator Harding proved his mettle in the reply that shot, resolute and unflinching, from his lips: "While sympathizing in a general way with the principle, I would want to consider carefully the circumstances. It depends, I think, on what two and two you have in mind."

Again the Literary Censor

"JURGEN AND THE CENSOR," the report of the Emergency Committee Organized to Protest against the Suppression of James Branch Cabell's "Jurgen," contains a full account of the proceedings taken against this book, with lists of the signers of the protest, which include many of the most important men and women writers in the United States; with letters from several of them and from Mr. Cabell and Mr. Sumner; and with notes on the laws of New York State and the United States in regard to "offensive, lewd, lascivious, and indecent" books. Although the case has not finally come to trial, and it is, of course, not yet certain what the verdict will be on the book, there can be no question as to the verdict which the Society for the Suppression of Vice and the State and Federal codes have already pronounced on themselves. The society is pitiably sincere and unutterably stupid. The codes are muddled and sloppy.

Presumably nothing can be gained by pointing another finger of wrath or scorn at the society. Its instigating and active members unite to a hundred per cent of moralistic zeal another hundred per cent of the fanaticism which sends men to the pillory for their opinions—we are not sure that the society would go on to the stake. Mr. Sumner's letter makes plain that he thinks of the society as exercising a noble impartiality when it proceeds against a considered work of art with the same firm tread as when it goes after a vender of pornographic pictures. But we should be willing to wager a considerable sum that the society would hesitate rather longer before invading, say, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where the nude human figure, we are informed, is exposed in great abundance, and without charge, to all who want to come to see it, than before invading the shop of some small stationer who might offer photographs of certain of those very masterpieces to any who would pay money for them. As it happens, the battle over the nude in art was fought out long ago, and even the Society for the Suppression of Vice has now learned to keep its preposterous hands off when they belong off. The society is blind enough on ordinary occasions, but it knows a vested interest when it sees one. And so with regard to the theater. If the Broadway stage is not organized to stir and encourage the sexual emotions, then nothing on earth is. But here the Society for the Suppression of Vice, though acute enough to smell out novelties, never touches the traditional and established forms of temptation.

So, also, with regard to books. Standard authors in standard places: these the society leaves unmolested. But it will not have standard authors paraded any more than it can help. Nor—and this is the worst of the whole matter—will it allow any contemporary writer to aim at becoming a standard author unless he does it in the literary fashion the society approves, or unless he steals, like George Moore, carefully upon the world under the veil of limited editions, expensive and subscribed for. The society claims, of course, with respect to pictures and standard authors, to be guided by notions of fitness and intention—that is, to allow works of art "to occupy the select place which art has chosen for her abode" and to make no attacks upon "standard literature for literary persons and students." But when it comes to literature still in the making it falls with deadly accuracy upon a work of art like "Jurgen" and refuses to see that the intention of the author and the sophisticated nature of the book ought to be taken into account at all. "Jurgen" is not a vested interest.

Well, the Society for the Suppression of Vice will go on bungling in its well-intentioned absurdity as long as the law lets it. There are always such persons. But there do not need to be such laws. What bothers most decent people about the whole affair is the feeling that without the law there is no way of protecting the young from corruption by mercenary creatures who put beauty to base uses. One eminent author writes to the Emergency Committee: "The Soc. for the Suppression of Vice is probably making a fool of itself—as it has done on more than one occasion. But I am old enough to feel very grateful to it for the cleansing of the news-stands of N. Y. from what they were fifty years ago." This is really too much like saying that while we are killing off mosquitoes we might as well kill off humming-birds too, because here and there respectable citizens exist who cannot tell the difference between a mosquito and a humming-bird. There is a difference; and there is a difference between "Jurgen" and merely nasty books. There is no possible reason why the law should be so drawn as to admit no distinctions. If an art gallery is privileged, so is a serious performance like "Jurgen." What if the immature or the senile discover it and snicker? They do exactly the same thing before hundreds of pictures and statues in the "select place which art has chosen for her abode." Dozens of juries could be found to convict any art gallery or any library in the country of having in its possession objects which might be used to promote "offensive, lewd, lascivious, and indecent" conduct; but prosecutors make distinctions upon the ground of intention and dignity and actual influence. The harm that may be done to the immature or the senile, even the law knows, is more than overbalanced by the good which beauty and honesty do to the public at large.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Farmer-Labor Campaign

By CHARLES PATRICK SWEENEY

IN these days when democracy is spoken so lightly as a word, and much less often followed as a custom, it should be refreshing to discover a political party which has endeavored to adopt it as a rule and a practice. While the Democrats and Republicans charge each other with being financed in Wall Street and of sending the "boys" to international bankers after money, the Farmer-Labor Party is financed solely by its rank and file membership, believing that ideals worth voting for are also worth paying something to get others to vote for. And herein lies one great reason why the party has not the ghost of a show to pile up a large vote in the November elections, as well as why it is the hope of patient men and women throughout the country that the new party may become a permanent institution in American political life.

It really makes no essential difference if the Farmer-Labor Party carries five States or one State or none at the elections. Nobody expects it to win. The decisiveness of its defeat this year might be considered as of slight importance in political calculations. Up to date no great enthusiasm over developments is warranted. Some newspapers will even ignore the party during the campaign, and not necessarily by any means through a sinister purpose to "suppress" legitimate news, but merely because in the life of the average newspaper owner or editor the Farmer-Labor Party will appear as one of the invariable small-fry "also ran" efforts that are seen every four years. But the Farmer-Labor Party is entitled to serious consideration, because a great many people are interested in it and because, irrespective of the vote it gets in November, it looks to many people throughout the country as the beginning of something in the beyond—say four years beyond—when Mr. Harding, possibly, will ask the people of the country to recall how much more tenderly their welfare was guarded by the Republicans than by the Democrats. By that time, in many minds, so many people will have been awakened to the futility of cat-and-mouse politics and so many new political alignments will have been made in various States that the Farmer-Labor Party may well be the party of real opposition and the medium of progressive political opinion. By that time, the Farmer-Labor Party expects also to have a war chest, a great dues-paying membership, and an efficient organization.

Whether you believe it or not, or whether your newspaper lets you know it or not, the United States is in a process of what the prohibition commissioner might let you call political refermentation. Things are happening. One day there is a political revolution in the State of Montana. Another day a most amazing victory at the polls for what the Denver *Post* calls "Reds" in Colorado. Again, organized labor in Texas swamps ex-Senator Bailey's effort to be Governor, despite the "100 Per Cent American"—and two hundred per cent anti-labor—full page advertisements about the perils of Gompersism. Mr. Esch, of Esch-Cummins Bill fame, gets a severe defeat in his effort for renomination in Wisconsin. Within two years, ten daily papers devoted to the interests of workers find audiences in the country and become definitely established. A press service aiming to knit together the labor press of the country and offset what it considers the bias of existing news agencies gets away to a flying start and now boasts a membership of seventy daily and weekly papers. Up in North Dakota the State Bank prospers as do the farmers under what the New York *Times* calls socialism, and the Chicago Federation of Labor decides to deposit its funds in said State Bank, until Chicago labor can run a bank of its own.

Those who are most conspicuous in their espousal of the Farmer-Labor Party know that in the light of the present campaign alone it is a pathetic picture. But they also know that it is not to be considered in the light of one single campaign. They reckon its birth along with other very significant developments in human affairs. They see it as an educational and inspirational force in American life, the kind of a force that is cumulative, and the developments of which may be far-reaching. They know that the indorsement of seven State Federations of Labor, heretofore almost uniformly Democratic in their political expressions, indicates a strong sentiment of sympathy.* They know that when the United Mine Workers of America indorse the idea of a labor party although their president, John Lewis, is a Republican and William Green, their treasurer, a Democrat, there is a new political orientation among the rank and file. These men see in the west-born rebellion against the two-party system the field for a new political experiment. To quote Robert M. Buck, editor of the *New Majority*, organ of the party:

> The old political parties have the people fooled into regarding themselves as consumers. Every man who works for a living and who thinks of himself as a consumer is a victim of this subtle deception. There is no hope for him so long as he believes consuming to be his fundamental status in the community. There is hope for him when he realizes that he is a producer. We are out to dissipate this widespread misconception and to induce the hand and brain workers and the farmers to see that the important thing to think about is how much they produce and how much they get out of what they produce—and who gets the rest. It's a slow process, but it's a sure process It's the kind of a process that cannot be beaten in the long run. A single campaign is important only in that it lays the foundation for or adds new impetus to the movement. The foundation for a party of producers is laid now. The votes cast for the Farmer-Labor Party in November will be important only as they afford us a chart for our immediately future efforts.

Says Mr. Christensen, the candidate:

> Any time a man asks you to join a political party or to support a political party without asking you for your campaign contribution as well, call a cop and have him pinched. He's working for somebody else than you and he's trying to get you to harm yourself.

It is not significant that the voters of the country have not fallen over each other in their eagerness to take Mr. Christensen's tip and invest in the Farmer-Labor Party. The voters of the country have not received the tip, nor will they, until Congress sees fit to adopt the suggestion Mr. Christensen made to the Kenyon Committee investigating campaign expenditures in Chicago: that Congress guarantee all political parties equal opportunity to present their re-

* Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Washington.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spective attitudes on all issues to the people during presidential campaigns. The method suggested—and it is worthy of serious consideration—is the purchase by the Government of sufficient space in the two largest papers in each city—one morning and one evening—to give the national committee of each party one column each day in which to present its case. Were this chance afforded all political parties the campaign would probably not be so dull and the outlook so hopeless.

Getting a party started will always be a gigantic undertaking, especially for one depending entirely upon small individual contributions of thousands of scattered working people. The mere task of initial organization of the Farmer-Labor Party has been formidable, and it must be stated in absolute frankness that, regarding the effort in the light of immediate campaign necessities, the poorest kind of a start has been made. Whereas a Republican or Democratic campaign may be said to start two years before election, with a highly-geared and well-organized machinery that can literally be set in motion by the pressing of a button, a large part of the Farmer-Labor Party task, starting as it did late in July, consisted of finding out just who was for and who against such a movement. With so hectic and inevitably so stormy an evolution, chaos was for a time almost unavoidable. There is not, for instance, even today, a well-recognizable national committee, and many States actually have no national committeemen. There has not been a meeting of even those national committeemen who do exist, since the Chicago convention. There is, however, a sub-committee, on strategy and operation, that has been designated to direct the party's effort in the present campaign. It might appear a bit ridiculous to say that the national committee of a political party has not had a meeting during a political campaign, but when you ask you will discover that the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee have also delegated their authority to small groups who are running things. The Farmer-Labor Party's directing committee is now formulating plans for last-minute action. Needless to say the lack of money and the lack of organization are bound to show in the result in November. For instance, just to get one circular containing the platform of the party and something about its candidates to the 30,000,000 voters of the country—obviously a more essential undertaking than for the established parties, the principles of which are known and which benefit moreover by columns of free newspaper publicity—would cost at least $1,500,000. And one circular is nothing! This is rather exasperating to a group of men and women endeavoring to find sufficient funds merely to get the party ticket on the ballot in the various States. Indeed the greater part of the money and effort hitherto has been expended for that essential, yet elementary, purpose. For the present the Farmer-Labor Party strength depends upon what it believes to be the soundness of its doctrines, the increasing drift toward them by awakening groups, and the wide-spread disgust with the old parties' avoidance of vital issues to register an emphatic vote of protest, and to consider that vote a deposit in the bank of a new political structure. No one can foretell what the future will bring. Certain it is that there is an intense longing on the part of a majority of Americans, though they may differ among themselves in shades of progressiveness, liberalism, or, if you will, radicalism, for a new middle-of-the-road party, a party based on action, not piffle, on constructive effort rather than on worn-out shibboleths. The Farmer-Labor Party offers this nucleus, perhaps, to be profoundly altered in the coming years, but at least raising a new beacon in the present bewildering twilight. No one for a moment expects Mr. Christensen to be elected. If he carries a single State it will be a triumph. But no one, be he ever so reactionary or blind to the trend of events, could peer, be it ever so slightly, beneath the surface and not hear the rumbling of the rising tide. Evolutionary, of course, radical, yes—radical as were George Washington and Patrick Henry in their time—and as American.

Self-Determining Haiti

IV. THE HAITIAN PEOPLE

By JAMES WELDON JOHNSON

THE first sight of Port-au-Prince is perhaps most startling to the experienced Latin-American traveler. Caribbean cities are of the Spanish-American type—buildings square and squat, built generally around a court, with residences and business houses scarcely interdistinguishable. Port-au-Prince is rather a city of the French or Italian Riviera. Across the bay of deepest blue the purple mountains of Gonave loom against the Western sky, rivaling the bay's azure depths. Back of the business section, spreading around the bay's great sweep and well into the plain beyond, rise the green hills with their white residences. The residential section spreads over the slopes and into the mountain tiers. High up are the homes of the well-to-do, beautiful villas set in green gardens relieved by the flaming crimson of the poinsettia. Despite the imposing mountains a man-made edifice dominates the scene. From the center of the city the great Gothic cathedral lifts its spires above the tranquil city. Well-paved and clean, the city prolongs the thrill of its first unfolding. Cosmopolitan yet quaint, with an old-world atmosphere yet a charm of its own, one gets throughout the feeling of continental European life. In the hotels and cafes the affairs of the world are heard discussed in several languages. The cuisine and service are not only excellent but inexpensive. At the Café Dereix, cool and scrupulously clean, dinner from *hors d'œuvres* to *glaces*, with wine, of course, recalling the famous ante-bellum hostelries of New York and Paris, may be had for six gourdes [$1.25].

A drive of two hours around Port-au-Prince, through the newer section of brick and concrete buildings, past the cathedral erected from 1903 to 1912, along the Champ de Mars where the new presidential palace stands, up into the Peu de Choses section where the hundreds of beautiful villas and grounds of the well-to-do are situated, permanently dispels any lingering question that the Haitians have been retrograding during the 116 years of their independence.

In the lower city, along the water's edge, around the market and in the Rue Républicaine, is the "local color." The long rows of wooden shanties, the curious little booths around the market, filled with jabbering venders and with scantily clad children, magnificent in body, running in and out, are no less picturesque and no more primitive, no humbler, yet cleaner, than similar quarters in Naples, in Lisbon, in Marseilles, and more justifiable than the great slums of civilization's centers—London and New York,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are totally without aesthetic redemption. But it is only the modernists in history who are willing to look at the masses as factors in the life and development of the country, and in its history. For Haitian history, like history the world over, has for the last century been that of cultured and educated groups. To know Haitian life one must have the privilege of being received as a guest in the houses of these latter, and they live in beautiful houses. The majority have been educated in France; they are cultured, brilliant conversationally, and thoroughly enjoy their social life. The women dress well. Many are beautiful and all vivacious and chic. Cultivated people from any part of the world would feel at home in the best Haitian society. If our guest were to enter to the Cercle Bellevue, the leading club of Port-au-Prince, he would find the courteous, friendly atmosphere of a men's club; he would hear varying shades of opinion on public questions, and could scarcely fail to be impressed by the thorough knowledge of world affairs possessed by the intelligent Haitian. Nor would his encounters be only with people who have culture and savoir vivre; he would meet the Haitian intellectuals—poets, essayists, novelists, historians, critics. Take for example such a writer as Fernand Hibbert. An English authority says of him, "His essays are worthy of the pen of Anatole France or Pierre Loti." And there is Georges Sylvaine, poet and essayist, conférencier at the Sorbonne, where his address was received with acclaim, author of books crowned by the French Academy, and an Officer of the Légion d'Honneur. Hibbert and Sylvaine are only two among a dozen or more contemporary Haitian men of letters whose work may be measured by world standards. Two names that stand out preeminently in Haitian literature are Oswald Durand, the national poet, who died a few years ago, and Damocles Vieux. These people, educated, cultured, and intellectual, are not accidental and sporadic offshoots of the Haitian people; they *are* the Haitian people and they are a demonstration of its inherent potentialities.

However, Port-au-Prince is not all of Haiti. Other cities are smaller replicas, and fully as interesting are the people of the country districts. Perhaps the deepest impression on the observant visitor is made by the country women. Magnificent as they file along the country roads by scores and by hundreds on their way to the town markets, with white or colored turbaned heads, gold-looped-ringed ears, they stride along straight and lithe, almost haughtily, carrying themselves like so many Queens of Sheba. The Haitian country people are kind-hearted, hospitable, and polite, seldom stupid but rather, quick-witted and imaginative. Fond of music, with a profound sense of beauty and harmony, they live simply but wholesomely. Their cabins rarely consist of only one room, the humblest having two or three, with a little shed front and back, a front and rear entrance, and plenty of windows. An aesthetic touch is never lacking —a flowering hedge or an arbor with trained vines bearing gorgeous colored blossoms. There is no comparison between the neat plastered-wall, thatched-roof cabin of the Haitian peasant and the traditional log hut of the South or the shanty of the more wretched American suburbs. The most notable feature about the Haitian cabin is its invariable cleanliness. At daylight the country people are up and about, the women begin their sweeping till the earthen or pebble-paved floor of the cabin is clean as can be. Then the yards around the cabin are vigorously attacked. In fact, nowhere in the country districts of Haiti does one find the filth and squalor which may be seen in any backwoods town in our own South. Cleanliness is a habit and a dirty Haitian is a rare exception. The garments even of the men who work on the wharves, mended and patched until little of the original cloth is visible, give evidence of periodical washing. The writer recalls a remark made by Mr. E. P. Pawley, an American, who conducts one of the largest business enterprises in Haiti. He said that the Haitians were an exceptionally clean people, that statistics showed that Haiti imported more soap per capita than any country in the world, and added, "They use it, too." Three of the largest soap manufactories in the United States maintain headquarters at Port-au-Prince.

The masses of the Haitian people are splendid material for the building of a nation. They are not lazy; on the contrary, they are industrious and thrifty. Some observers mistakenly confound primitive methods with indolence. Anyone who travels Haitian roads is struck by the hundreds and even thousands of women, boys, and girls filing along mile after mile with their farm and garden produce on their heads or loaded on the backs of animals. With modern facilities, they could market their produce much more efficiently and with far less effort. But lacking them they are willing to walk and carry. For a woman to walk five to ten miles with a great load of produce on her head which may barely realize her a dollar is doubtless primitive, and a wasteful expenditure of energy, but it is not a sign of laziness. Haiti's great handicap has been not that her masses are degraded or lazy or immoral. It is that they are ignorant, due not so much to mental limitations as to enforced illiteracy. There is a specific reason for this. Somehow the French language, in the French-American colonial settlements containing a Negro population, divided itself into two branches, French and Creole. This is true of Louisiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe, and also of Haiti. Creole is an Africanized French and must not be thought of as a mere dialect. The French-speaking person cannot understand Creole, excepting a few words, unless he learns it. Creole is a distinct tongue, a graphic and very expressive language. Many of its constructions follow closely the African idioms. For example, in forming the superlative of greatness, one says in Creole, "He is great among great men," and a merchant woman, following the native idiom, will say, "You do not wish anything beautiful if you do not buy this." The upper Haitian class, approximately 500,000, speak and know French, while the masses, probably more than 2,000,000 speak only Creole. Haitian Creole is grammatically constructed, but has not to any general extent been reduced to writing. Therefore, these masses have no means of receiving or communicating thoughts through the written word. They have no books to read. They cannot read the newspapers. The children of the masses study French for a few years in school, but it never becomes their every-day language. In order to abolish Haitian illiteracy, Creole must be made a printed as well as a spoken language. The failure to undertake this problem is the worst indictment against the Haitian Government.

This matter of language proves a handicap to Haiti in another manner. It isolates her from her sister republics. All of the Latin-American republics except Brazil speak Spanish and enjoy an intercourse with the outside world denied Haiti. Dramatic and musical companies from Spain, from Mexico and from the Argentine annually tour all of the Spanish-speaking republics. Haiti is deprived of all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such instruction and entertainment from the outside world because it is not profitable for French companies to visit the three or four French-speaking islands in the Western Hemisphere.

Much stress has been laid on the bloody history of Haiti and its numerous revolutions. Haitian history has been all too bloody, but so has that of every other country, and the bloodiness of the Haitian revolutions has of late been unduly magnified. A writer might visit our own country and clip from our daily press accounts of murders, robberies on the principal streets of our larger cities, strike violence, race riots, lynchings, and burnings at the stake of human beings, and write a book to prove that life is absolutely unsafe in the United States. The seriousness of the frequent Latin-American revolutions has been greatly overemphasized. The writer has been in the midst of three of these revolutions and must confess that the treatment given them on our comic opera stage is very little farther removed from the truth than the treatment which is given in the daily newspapers. Not nearly so bloody as reported, their interference with people not in politics is almost negligible. Nor should it be forgotten that in almost every instance the revolution is due to the plotting of foreigners backed up by their Governments. No less an authority than Mr. John H. Allen, vice-president of the National City Bank of New York, writing on Haiti in the May number of *The Americas*, the National City Bank organ, who says, "It is no secret that the revolutions were financed by foreigners and were profitable speculations."

In this matter of change of government by revolution, Haiti must not be compared with the United States or with England; it must be compared with other Latin American republics. When it is compared with our next door neighbor, Mexico, it will be found that the Government of Haiti has been more stable and that the country has experienced less bloodshed and anarchy. And it must never be forgotten that throughout not an American or other foreigner has been killed, injured or, as far as can be ascertained, even molested. In Haiti's 116 years of independence, there have been twenty-five presidents and twenty-five different administrations. In Mexico, during its 99 years of independence, there have been forty-seven rulers and eighty-seven administrations. "Graft" has been plentiful, shocking at times, but who in America, where the Tammany machines and the municipal rings are notorious, will dare to point the finger of scorn at Haiti in this connection.

And this is the people whose "inferiority," whose "retrogression," whose "savagery," is advanced as a justification for intervention—for the ruthless slaughter of three thousand of its practically defenseless sons, with the death of a score of our own boys, for the utterly selfish exploitation of the country by American big finance, for the destruction of America's most precious heritage—her traditional fair play, her sense of justice, her aid to the oppressed. "Inferiority" always was the excuse of ruthless imperialism until the Germans invaded Belgium, when it became "military necessity." In the case of Haiti there is not the slightest vestige of any of the traditional justifications, unwarranted as these generally are, and no amount of misrepresentation in an era when propaganda and censorship have had their heyday, no amount of slander, even in a country deeply prejudiced where color is involved, will longer serve to obscure to the conscience of America the eternal shame of its last five years in Haiti. *Fiat justitia, ruat coelum!*

A Note on Comedy

By LOUIS CROCKER

THE pleasure that men take in comedy arises from their feeling of superiority to the persons involved in the comic action. The Athenian who laughed with Aristophanes over the predicament of the hungry gods, the contemporary New Yorker who laughs over a comedian blundering into the wrong bedroom, are stirred by an identical emotion. The difference in the intellectual character of the two inheres in the nature of the stimulus by which the emotion is in each case aroused. In the former the pleasure was conditioned in a high and arduous activity of the mind; in the latter it arises from a momentary and accidental superiority of situation. High and low comedy are dependent in all ages upon the temper of the auditor whose pleasurable emotion of superiority must be awakened. He who has brought a critical attitude of mind to bear upon the institutions and the ways of men will cooperate with the creative activity of a faculty which he himself possesses and has exercised; he to whom all criticism is alien can evidently find no causes for superiority within himself and must be flattered by the sight of physical mishaps and confusions which, for the moment, are not his own. Pure comedy, in brief, and that comedy of physical intrigue which is commonly called farce, cannot from the nature of things differ in the effect they strive to produce. But they must adapt their methods of attaining this common end to the character of the spectator whose emotions they desire to touch.

It follows that pure comedy is rare. Historically we find it flourishing in small, compact, and like-minded groups: the free citizens of Athens, the fashionables of Paris and London who applauded Molière and Congreve. But in all three instances the reign of pure comedy was brief, and in the latter two precarious and artificial at best. With the loss of Athenian freedom, intrigue took the place of social and moral criticism; no later poet dared, as Aristophanes had done in "The Acharnians," to deride warlikeless in the midst of war. In the New Comedy public affairs and moral criticism disappeared from the Attic stage. In Rome there was no audience for pure comedy. Its function was exercised by the satirists alone, precisely as a larger and nobler comic force lives in the satires of Dryden than in the plays of Congreve. Nor should it be forgotten that Molière himself derives from a tradition of farce which reaches, through its Italian origin, to Latin comedy and the New Comedy of Greece, and that the greater number of his own pieces depends for effectiveness on the accidents and complications of intrigue. When he rose above this subject matter and sought the true sources of comic power and appeal in "L'Ecole des Femmes" and "Tartuffe," he aroused among the uncritical a hatred which pursued him beyond the grave.

The modern theater, which must address itself primarily to that bulwark of things as they are, the contented middle classes, is, necessarily, a bleak enough place for the spirit of comedy. These audiences will scarcely experience a pleasurable feeling of superiority at the comic exposure of their favorite delusions. Hence Shaw is not popular on the stage; a strong comic talent, like Henri Lavedan's, begins by directing its arrows at those grosser vices which its audience also abhors and then sinks into melodrama; isolated exceptions, such as the success of Hauptmann's massive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satire of bureaucratic tyranny in "The Beaver Coat," scarcely mitigate the loneliness of comedy on the stage of our time. The comic spirit which once sought refuge in satire now seeks it in the novel—that great, inclusive form of art which can always find the single mind to which its speech is articulate.

But since men still desire to laugh in the theater, there has arisen out of a long and complicated tradition the sentimental comedy. Here the basic action is pseudo-realistic and emotional. Into it are brought, however, odd and absurd characters whose function is the same as that of Shakespeare's Fools in tragedy. They break the tension and release the pleasurable feeling of superiority. More often, however, they encroach largely on the sentimental action, and then we have the most popular form of theatrical entertainment among us—a reckless mixture of melodrama and farce. And this form caters, beyond all others, to its huge audience's will to superiority. Men and women laugh at the fools whom they despise, at the villains whose discomfiture vindicates their peculiar sense of social and moral values; they laugh with the heroes in whom those values are embodied and unfailingly triumphant.

From such facile methods pure comedy averts its face. It, too, arouses laughter; it, too, releases the pleasurable emotion of superiority. But it demands a superiority that is hard won and possessed by few. It is profoundly concerned with the intellect that has in very truth risen above the common follies and group delusions of mankind; it seeks its fellowship among those who share its perceptions or are prepared to share them. It demands not only moral and intellectual freedom in its audience; it demands a society in which that freedom can be exercised. It cannot flourish, as the central example of Attic comedy illustrates, except in a polity where art and speech are free. And any one who reflects on the shifting panorama of political institutions will realize at once how few have been the times and places in history in which, even given a critically minded audience, the comic dramatist could have spoken to that audience in a public playhouse.

The immediate example in our own period is that of Bernard Shaw. Whatever the ultimate value of his plays may be, he is to us the truest representative of the comic spirit. Some of his plays have, on occasion, quite frankly been removed from the stage by the police power; none are truly popular except in the study. The bourgeois audiences who at times witness their performance have set up between themselves and Shaw the protective fiction that he is a high-class clown. Since they cannot, in self-defense, laugh with him, they attempt to laugh at him, and thus save their pleasure and their reputation for cleverness at once. True comedy, in a word, is a test both of the inner freedom of the mind and of the outer freedom of the society in which men live. Its life has always been brief and hazardous. Nor is it likely to flourish unless the liberties of mankind are achieved in a new measure and with a new intensity. For the great comic dramatist, if he would gain the most modest success, must gather in a single theater as many free minds in a free state as Lucian or Swift or Heine seek out and make their own in a whole generation.

Beginning with its first issue in October, The Nation will change its publication day from Saturday to Wednesday.

In the Driftway

THERE were so many policemen about Madison Square that the Drifter left his perch atop the bus to inquire why. "Some sort of Bolsheviki meeting in the Garden," a bluecoat informed him. "No, no trouble yet; but we watch them furriners." The Drifter headed forthwith for the Garden; he discovered that there was a meeting to raise money for medical relief for Soviet Russia. The immense hall was packed as the Drifter had not seen it packed for a Presidential candidate in a Presidential year. Young Russians were policing the aisles and herding late-comers to the topmost gallery, but the Drifter eluded them long enough to persuade himself that the policeman was right: it was a crowd of furriners. And they were mostly young, with the eager, inquiring, believing faces of the youth of New York's East Side. Such meetings as this were church to them, the Drifter meditated. Here they voiced their idealism and aspiration and inhaled inspiration.

* * * * *

THE Drifter found himself cornered at the foot of the gallery stairs, when he recalled a ruse that had worked before. With dignity he whispered the magic word "Press," and was separated from the gallery herd and ushered to the front. Once more the Drifter's eye wandered across the sea of foreign faces. Beneath the speakers' stand it fell upon an alien to the crowd, a gray-haired, benevolently fishy-eyed plain-clothes man—the lines of his tobacco-chewing face irresistibly reminding the Drifter of Mr. Harding. Through all the delirious waves of cheering and all the surly tides of boos, that face remained impassive, the monotonous chew, chew, chew never varying for a second—an unmistakably American face. The crowd booed mention of Poland, of Lloyd George, of the American Federation of Labor; it cheered lustily the name of Debs; it burst into tumultuous applause when Dudley Field Malone called the Government of the United States "the most reactionary force in the world today." It was clear that though the crowd might read newspapers, it thought its own thoughts, and it was not made up of men who mistook Czecho-Slovakia for a breakfast food. But its real moment came when the Soviet Ambassador, Mr. Martens, was introduced. A little, almost painfully shy man stood up, and smiled like a bashful schoolgirl. But the crowd went wild—not as furriners, but as an American crowd goes wild. It had not lived in America without learning something. It clapped; it stamped; it cheered; it tore its newspapers into scraps and tossed them into the air; it threw its straw hats roofwards, balconywards, platformwards, and it refused to be silenced despite all the efforts of the speakers for twelve long minutes—until suddenly, from the middle of the hall, a high clear woman's voice imposed itself on the tumult, made itself heard, resounded in stillness. A moment later the thousands took up the refrain—the chorus of the Russian Revolutionary Anthem, a strangely-modulated churchly hymn. Then silence again, and Martens began reading a prepared speech. Martens had the gift of smiling, but the Drifter found his English hard to follow. Besides, the Drifter, being of the Press, hates prepared speeches. He went home. Yes, he thought, he agreed with the Madison Square policeman—them furriners would bear watching. He was not quite sure why.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Making the Ballot Count?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just reread your article of September 4 in which you conclude that "the person who throws away his ballot next November will be the one who votes for either Cox or Harding." Is not this protest emphatic rather than effective? I have admired your unfailing refusal to suppress facts, and your rare determination—often, no doubt, at great cost and risk—to give the public the benefit of unbiased reports upon world happenings. I have rejoiced to see your influence grow far beyond the ordinary test of advertising value.

More than that, I sympathize with the grounds of your complaint. The pressing need for answer to our domestic problems to me seems no more obvious than does our unpreparedness to make that answer. Worse still, with respect to the accepted principles of representative government we are struggling in a sea of confusion and obscurity. The Senate is charged with usurpation for daring to inquire whether a treaty or a league should be ratified. For prosecutions to guard public safety prosecutions to gratify private hate and to serve partisan purpose have been substituted. In short we are the most modern victims of "wilful" aristocracy. For all that the proceedings of the old party conventions showed little or no wholesome revulsion. The protests were colorless. During the war popular response to the colors was fine because in it the grave differences of opinion were drowned to serve a national cause. The political response to the "after the war" problems was pathetic because we sought to revamp by the old keynote oratory. The greatest struggle of which history tells, had raised into prominence not one new figure to cope with revolutionized conditions. No Lincoln rose out of the conflict to tell for all time that the national soul had been gripped, and to prove that new problems call for new treatment. No wonder the attitude of the public has been listless.

But granting all this, and as much more as you might add, what is the remedy? A new party of course, provided there is the ability to diagnose the essential ailment and the common purpose to apply the appropriate relief. We had an abundance of promise and threat of independent movements. Doctrines were heralded, and names were bandied about without leave or reason. By the drag-net process the bearers of all complaints were assembled. As a result there were, as it seems, more planks than delegates. There was no supreme issue to still the babel of voices. We lacked both the inspiration of a supreme cause and the will for sacrifice of individual hobbies. Particularly the issues which you emphasize were hopelessly stranded upon the rock of discord. In saying that a vote for Harding or Cox is lost, you must admit that a vote for Debs or Christensen can not be saved. How could the admitted failures of independent conventions be cured by indorsing their hopeless outcome? You admit that neither Debs nor Christensen can be elected. You virtually concede that neither should be elected. You appear to recommend a protest vote to destroy, not to construct—at least for the period to be covered by this election.

You might have directed your advice to congressional elections. Results might be gained in particular districts; definite principles might there triumph; and independent groups in the legislative body might score out of all proportion to their numbers. Indeed, indications are that our two-party system is doomed to travel the way of the much ridiculed continental method, which allows of the combination of different groups as varying questions arise.

But your advice goes to the presidential election. This involves one department represented by one man for a term of four years. There is no room for parleying now or for compromise afterwards. Only one man can be elected, and he will wield greater influence than any ruler of the world, during a period fraught with tremendous consequences for us and for civilization. You admit that this man will be either Harding or Cox. Remembering the splendid fight that you made to save fundamental principles of free government and bearing in mind the questions that without your aid might not now be accepted as constituting the supreme issue where, I respectfully ask, is your difficulty? The election of Cox would necessarily reverse everything for which you fought. You must admit that Harding's triumph would point in the right direction.

You would have supported Johnson, who it is true sympathizes with your domestic reforms, but who made his contest upon the League, the Treaty and free speech. You would have supported Knox, solely, I assume, for his stand upon the issues just named. Harding has the support of both of them as he has of every Republican Senator whom you urged to fight and whose courage during the last two years gave you hope for our Republic. To my mind the nomination of Moses in New Hampshire, Brandegee in Connecticut, and Lenroot in Wisconsin constitutes a more effective protest than a hopeless popular vote of protest as you recommend. Neither can I see virtue in even so much as a discouraging attitude towards men who have made so splendid a fight. Both good morals and sound policy would seem to dictate aggressive support for them and for their cause. How else can the faith of men be preserved?

Apart from all this the essential issues are at least presented by the platforms of the two parties. What is lacking the candidates have supplied. Harding's votes in the Senate were given for the extreme reservations. Since the convention his utterances make it clear that as President he would absolutely protect us against the iniquities of both League and Treaty, and also against the abuses of a one-man government. It is clear that his demand for a return to representative government is far more than a campaign utterance. He is open-minded, and without malice. He has never fanned the flame of race hatred, he is a typical American, glad to listen, perhaps slow to decide, but sure to stand. If I had no other reason I would support him as an irreconcilable enemy of autocracy. After all that is the foundation issue everywhere. Before going into action we must clear the decks—if you please, begin all over again. "Oust the dynasty," is the watchword of the day. Let us do at home, what we have helped do elsewhere.

CHARLES NAGEL

Manchester, Massachusetts, September 11

"If Thine Enemy Hunger—"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Germany is cleaning house—slowly but surely. That applies to her physical, mental, and political conditions, and it is my opinion that she will have her house in order when other nations of the world are only beginning to realize that such a process is also necessary for them. There is still great suffering, but it is borne with resignation and a solemn determination to overcome the difficulties to be surmounted. Extreme radicalism is becoming confined to smaller numbers, and will become unimportant and less dangerous with the betterment of condition in food, clothing, and coal.

There is still considerable pessimism regarding the spread of bolshevism. This dragon of fear may be brought down, and I think it will, by the dominance of common sense among the German people; but there is one absolutely sure way of avoiding this danger to Germany and the world. I say the world, for if bolshevism is allowed to get her grip on Germany all Europe will automatically go the same way; and who will predict how short or how long a time it will take to travel across the ocean—as travel it will if it is not confined to its present limits. This spread of bolshevism would mean a set-back to civilization of at least a century. But the one absolutely sure way of avoiding this calamity is for the former Allied and neutral nations of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world to get together and furnish foodstuffs, clothing, and raw materials for the rehabilitation of German industries.

When, not long ago, an American newspaper offered a prize to the married woman who would in the fewest words indicate the surest way to make a husband happy one woman wrote "Feed the Beast," and she got the prize.

This maxim cannot be supposed to apply to an American husband alone. It applies to all men. The political solidarity—perhaps existence—of Germany will depend upon its stomach. Next winter will be the critical period of its history—and therewith the history of the world. If the nations of the world should fail through their blinded and prejudiced eyes to see and grasp the importance of the necessity for restoring healthful and prosperous conditions to the great industries which for decades proved to be the heart-strings of the economic world, why should not America alone undertake to reap the credit and the benefits of maintaining the world's equilibrium?

Why should it not be America that with its overpowering sense of adherence to the square deal should proceed to help a stricken people to reclaim itself? Germany relies upon American help to rebuild herself. As one of the present government leaders said to me not long ago, "We stand or fall with American fat."

I write you these opinions because I have just returned from a considerable stay in Germany.

New York, September 12 LUDWIG NISSEN

Another Candidate

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The editorial in your issue of September 4 urging voters "to roll up a big popular vote against the old parties and in favor of a radical movement" and declaring that "the Socialist Party and the Farmer-Labor Party are the only ones for which it is in the least worth while to vote," ignores the most thoroughly radical movement of all those on foot.

Single Taxers only recently awoke to the fact that parlor discussions and the passing around of "Progress and Poverty" constituted a very slow method of spreading the truths of a great vital issue, but when they at last got busy and formed a national party they polled more votes at their first election than did the Socialists at their first election. Unlike many of the Socialist groups, the Single Taxers propose to bring relief from present conditions without violence and without a great social upheaval. Moreover, we do not confine our efforts to the benefiting of one or two classes, but, while our economic adjustment would be gradual, *all* classes to whom the problem of living has become more and more difficult, year after year, would from the start experience some relief, and without despoiling the capitalist he would automatically be transformed into the friendly cooperator he was intended to be.

So do, please, add the name of Mr. Macauley to your list of those worthy of attracting votes from Cox and Harding.

Westfield, New Jersey, September 15 C. P. B.

[Our correspondent's point is well taken. We should not have forgotten Mr. Macauley's name.—EDITOR *The Nation.*]

Anti-Commotion

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I give you my hearty thanks and congratulations for your editorial No More Race Discrimination of August 7. I regard the eighty-seven thousand of Japanese descent as an asset to the State and nation as really as are the others. I regard all of this anti-Japanese commotion as inevitably hostile to world peace and am delighted to see *The Nation* standing squarely on the right side.

Claremont, California, August 20 HENRY P. PERKINS

Books

Eternal Africa

Africa and the Discovery of America. Volume I. By Leo Wiener. Innes & Sons.

The Republic of Liberia. By R. C. F. Maughan. Charles Scribner's Sons.

La France au Maroc. By Berthe Georges-Gaulis. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.

The Belgian Congo and the Berlin Act. By Arthur Berriedale Keith. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

The Black Man's Burden. By E. D. Morel. London: The National Labour Press.

Empire and Commerce in Africa. By Leonard Woolf. London: The Labour Research Department.

Agadir. Joseph Caillaux. Paris: Albin Michel.

HERE are seven books representing five interesting points of view, but all of them about Africa. First, a scientific student of languages connects Africa in new ways with the discovery of America; then two officials, English and French, write in studied praise of the work of Europe in Africa, past, present, and future; an orthodox historian sets down in careful and unemotional phrase the legal relation of Europe to the heart of the dark continent. Then comes revolt. Two reformers writing, one from the political and the other from the economic point of view, say plain and biting words concerning the relations of black and white in this ancient continent; and finally, as commentary upon all of this, a prime minister of France, recently tried for treason, tells of the meaning of Agadir.

No age of the world, ancient or modern, has been able to escape Africa. We may, according to our birthplace or color or lineage, bewail this or feel a secret uplift because of it; but it is, in either case, true that from the beginning of human civilization, on the Nile and Euphrates, around the shores of the Mediterranean, in central and in northern Europe and in America, continually, each century, at one time or another, centers world interest in this old and mighty continent. And so again today Africa steps forward in the thought of men.

Professor Wiener shows us the amazing interaction of Africa, America, and Europe in the early days of the slave trade. The layman cannot judge of the exact weight of the mass of material adduced because the extraordinary author is master of more languages than most people have heard of, much less know. His book indicates the widest scholarship. The conclusions of Mr. Wiener are striking: "When I began my scrutiny, I was firmly convinced, as is the universal belief, that tobacco, manioc, yams, sweet potatoes, and peanuts were blessings bestowed upon the world by the Indians. A cursory study excluded the yams and the manioc. Soon the peanuts followed in their wake. Next came the sweet potatoes, and at last the tobacco. It turned out that American archaeology was to a great extent built on sand. But the most painful discovery was in the line of Indian religion. Here everything turned out to be topsy-turvy. In this first volume I show that the Negroes have had a far greater influence upon American civilization than has heretofore been suspected."

The average layman assumes that the horrors of the slave trade and slavery have passed and that today we have a pacific economic and benevolent invasion of Africa from Europe for the purpose of its ultimate civilization. This is the uncritical attitude of Mr. Maughan, British consul-general at Monrovia. His study of Liberia tries on the one hand to say pleasant things concerning Liberia, and on the other hand to show British merchants that now and here is their chance to exploit a rich land. The unspoken assumption is that what is for the good of the British merchant is for the good of Liberia. He sees the possibilities of Liberia and rightly complains that "for some curious reason, which I must confess has hitherto completely

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

baffled me, it has usually been customary to write of Liberia and the Liberians in a tone of gentle melancholy; to descant upon the country and the people to whom it belongs as with a pen dipped in sighs, and generally to regard them with the despondent air of the good old Scots mission doctor, who was wont to raise the spirits of his convalescent patients by reminding them of 'hoo often they went off i' the relapse, ye ken.'" Elsewhere in the book it appears that Mr. Maughan's encouragement with regard to Liberia is due to his knowledge of what Liberia may mean as a possession to British wealth. He cannot, for instance, "conceive any situation more unfortunate than that of a country where the education of the masses has been overdone," and consequently thinks that "it would seem highly undesirable that immigration from the United States to Liberia [should], for the present at any rate, assume larger proportions than it has done for many years past."

Mme. Georges-Gaulis goes a step further. Her work is a paean of praise of the French general who has just been admitted to the French Immortals and whose latest achievement has been the "pacification" of Morocco. Of this work the author is enthusiastic and says: "General Lyautey's work will remain. The attitude which he adopted on the front of the field of action and which he persists in even today has caused his name to be inscribed on history's pages. The reconstruction of Morocco has been effected; it has already become the model for our Allies to follow." "'I believe in action,' said the general one day to an astonished Frenchman who had just come to Morocco." And so forth, for a couple of hundred pages with only this ray of light. "'Pacification and not conquest' is his motto, and he repeats this constantly just as he reiterates that there are no inferior races."

Professor Keith, formerly of the British Colonial Office and now at the University of Edinburgh, writes of the international character of the Belgian Congo. This is the work of an orthodox British imperialist who, without imagination or any great degree of sympathy with the natives, writes a book which contains a very short sketch of the Congo, followed by three chapters on the inception of the Congo Free State, four more on the work of the State, and two on its well-known failure. The remaining nine chapters have to do with the reorganization of the Congo Free State as a Belgian colony, with a study of the new laws and arrangements, and an examination of the relation of the Congo Free State to the Peace settlement. With most students of the war, Mr. Keith recognizes the close connection of Africa with that great catastrophe. "Whatever be the final verdict of history on the part played by the question of colonial expansion among the causes of the European War, two features have emerged in the course of the conflict which render the problem of the future of Central Africa of vital importance to the United Kingdom and its allies."

While Mr. Keith acknowledges that all nations have sinned in their treatment of the African races he thinks that the crimes of Germany are the greatest, but, chiefly, apparently, because of her determination to have African colonies at the expense of England and France. "The demand is made that not only shall the former territories be restored, but that they shall be increased at the expense of France, Portugal, and Belgium so that all Central Africa from sea to sea shall be in the hands of Germany, which then by means of submarine bases on either coast will effectively menace the ocean trade of the Allies. The demand for so large accessions of territory, though justified also on commercial grounds, rests essentially on the second factor which has emerged in the course of the war, the realization of the military potentialities in the training under modern conditions of the natives of Africa."

The study of the Congo Free State brings clearly forward the restless personal ambition of Leopold and the extraordinary power which he snatched from under the nose of the civilized world and wielded in Central Africa. The Congo Free State was never international, but was in fact a private project of the King of Belgium, for which he secured the recognition of the civilized world. That this was possible is extraordinary, but it came through the rivalries of France, Germany, and England. England could not interfere if she kept her hold on Egypt, while both France and Germany expected to inherit whatever Belgium secured. Could it not be said that the World War resulted from the attempt to cash the blank check which Leopold handed Bismarck in return for German recognition of the Congo Free State? "This left Leopold absolute monarch of 900,000 square miles of territory with twenty or thirty millions of people, unrestrained by any legislation or any effective legal requirement."

Here we begin to get an insight into the depths of degradation to which modern civilization has led the world in its relation to Africa, but it takes plain speaking like that of E. D. Morel to expose the real atrocities. Mr. Morel's book is in part historical and in part a setting forth of selected stories of white atrocities all over Africa. He says: "The narrow, irregular streets of a Moorish town, into which shells from warships riding on the sparkling blue waters of the western Atlantic are falling in an incessant and murderous hail, smashing the white-walled, flat-roofed houses and splashing them all over with the blood of the white-clad inhabitants who sprawl in mangled heaps at the doors of their homes—between such a scene as this and the pitted, scarred battlefields of Europe today with the blasted stumps which once were trees, and the piles of masonry and timber which once were towns and villages, there appears at first thought no connecting link of circumstance. Yet it was the violence done to Casablanca which furnished the first direct incentive to that 'era of ambitions, covetousness and conflicts in Europe,' whose fruits the people of Europe have been reaping for the past five years.

"Africa has always repaid her exploiters."

Morel himself is no particular lover of Africans. He has traveled in Africa, has written seven or eight books on aspects of the African problems, and particularly was one of those who exposed Belgian misrule in the Congo. During the war, however, his liberalism was interpreted as sympathy for Germany, and since the Belgian exposé was due to him and the unfortunate Sir Roger Casement, his sympathy for Africa has been interpreted as part of a pro-German "plot." In truth, his attitude toward the black men is that of the liberal Englishman: that is to say, he is opposed to the past atrocities and wants Africa helped in every benevolent and philanthropic way. He has, however, no conception of a self-governing, independent black Africa. Indeed, he suspects and rather dislikes the educated African and certainly has no faith in his independent future. His attitude is best summed up in this word from his introduction. His book "seeks to lay down the fundamental principles of a humane and practical policy in the government of Africa by white men.

"We stand on the threshold of a new era. The moment is propitious for the birth of an international conscience in regard to Africa. Great social changes are in process of a development among the white peoples of the earth. The seat of power is shifting from the propertied classes to the producing masses. The latter will find themselves invested before long with executive duties in many spheres of government, with whose problems they are not familiar; among them the administration of dark-skinned peoples."

Mr. Morel, however, is frank in recognizing the terrific burden of the black man—"the man of sorrows of the human family"—and says that the problem of the native races today "centers henceforth upon the black man, as the African is called, although few Africans are wholly black." He says that the real crisis in the black man's existence comes today and that industrial exploitation if carried out ruthlessly may do what slavery, the slave trade, and the political domination of Africa has hitherto failed to do—exterminate the race.

"A subsidiary purpose of the volume is to impress the reader with the remarkable manner in which the political history of Europe during the past half century has been affected by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reflex action upon European affairs of the proceedings of European governments in Africa. Those to whom history appeals as a long chain of inter-connected links, who believe that wrongdoing by men and nations brings its inevitable aftermath, and that human records are stamped all over with the proofs of it, may be forgiven, perhaps, if they are tempted to see in the desolation and misery into which Europe is plunged the Nemesis of Europe's actions in Africa."

Mr. Leonard Woolf is, if possible, even more outspoken. He has perhaps the advantage of a more detached scientific attitude than Mr. Morel in that he clearly sees the economic motives of Europe. He says that just as long as the modern white world is organized for individual profit just so long it is going to bring suffering and destruction upon the peoples of the earth. "Europe in the last century gained control over its physical environment with a rapidity and to a degree never attained before in any place or age. To dominate the earth, to ride the winds, and to harness fire and water are great and valuable achievements, but their greatness and value also depend upon whether the world's passions and beliefs are harnessed and under control. Some people seem to think that a maniac with a modern revolver in his hand is a nobler spectacle than a maniac with bow and arrow from the Stone Age. Perhaps he is, but at least it cannot be denied that he is infinitely more dangerous. So, too, the uncontrolled passions of fifty million men and women armed with twelve-inch guns and aeroplanes may be a finer thing to contemplate than the blind instincts of five thousand savages armed with tomahawks, but national passions firing off twelve-inch guns are more dangerous to humanity than tribal instinct directing a tomahawk. It is only because from our schooldays history is represented falsely to us as the logic of events rather than the logic of men's beliefs and desires that we are not driven by fear, if by nothing else, to consider continually the possible results of national and communal beliefs and desires."

Mr. Woolf goes on to show that "between 1880 and 1914 the states of Britain, France, and Germany each acquired an immense colonial empire outside Europe. These empires were empires in the literal sense of the word: they were founded by conquest, sometimes openly acknowledged, and sometimes disguised under various synonyms for civilization. The territories acquired were incorporated, usually against the wishes of their inhabitants, in the European state and the inhabitants were subjected to the autocratic rule of the European state. The territory acquired by the British state in this way was about 3¼ million square miles, and the population subjected to its rule was about 46 million. The French state acquired 4 million square miles, and a population of over 50 million; the German state 1 million square miles, and a population of 15 million."

He strikes the keynote of all "Negro problems" when he says that "if the relations of Europe to Africa are to change, the beliefs and desires of Europeans in Africa and with regard to Africans must change. Hence when this class of thinker or reformer makes concrete proposals, they take the form, not of a change from imperialism to internationalism, but of a change in the social and economic relations between the African and the European. The 'native' is no longer to be regarded as the 'live stock' on Europe's African estate, as the market for the shoddy of our factories and our cheap gin, or as the 'cheap labor' by means of which the concessionnaire may supply Europe with rubber and ivory and himself with a fortune, but as a human being with a right to his own land and his own life, with a right even to be educated and to determine his own destiny, to be considered, in that fantastic scheme of human government which men have woven over the world, an end in himself rather than an instrument to other people's ends."

From this climax of arraignment of modern commercial empire we may turn by way of startling contrast to the complacent "apologia pro vita sua" by a man who is discredited in many respects but who knows his France and Europe well enough to adduce the theft of Morocco as an excuse for his foreign policy. In Joseph Caillaux's account of his foreign policies we get a rather illuminating even if ghastly glimpse of the way in which the peoples of the world have been the pawns of politics. The book surveys France's experience in her foreign affairs from 1877 to 1911. It proves beyond any doubt (albeit inadvertently) that the distribution of Africa has been the root of nearly all the various political controversies which have upset France, Germany, England, and Russia for the last forty years. Africa was "the roots of the war."

Here we are introduced to the very penetralia of high politics. France finds her interests in Morocco blocked by England. She therefore becomes willing to withdraw from Egypt in favor of Great Britain. Germany becomes incensed but signs with the rest a treaty at Algeciras, which neither France nor England have any purpose to keep, but it forms "a good working basis." The purpose of France to seize Morocco with the consent of Great Britain leads to the appearance of the German warship at Agadir. Thereupon a "showdown" is demanded. Germany, finding that immediate war is impossible on account of her banking situation, consents to receive an additional slice of Central Africa while France takes Morocco. Everything is settled except the World War, but Caillaux in its great lambent light congratulates himself: he put it off three years!

Here we are back where we started. A continent with hundreds of millions of human beings has been made the football of the nations until the nations have suffered because of it the greatest revolution humanity has ever known. Whether this will teach us anything time only can tell.

W. E. Burghardt Du Bois

Short Story Art and Artifice

Youth and the Bright Medusa. By Willa Cather. Alfred A. Knopf.

The Surprises of Life. By Georges Clemenceau. Translated by Grace Hall. Doubleday, Page and Company.

Jewish Children. By "Shalom Aleichem." From the Yiddish by Hannah Berman. Alfred A. Knopf.

MISS WILLA CATHER has worked at herself and her art. Today the product is finished and represents the triumph of mind over Nebraska. This is no jest. Consider even the sounder of our writers from the "great valley" and beyond—William Allen White, Vachel Lindsey. How gifted they are and how incurably provincial. Miss Cather started out, fortunately, not only with a burning sense of beauty, but with a really honest mind. She settled in Greenwich village and was able to separate its wheat from its tares. Her vision has come to be of an intense and naked clearness and she herself one of our few thoroughly serious artists.

The form no less than the substance of these stories bears witness to a fine self-discipline. It has neither the French nor the contemporary American short-story mechanism. The fable is driven neither toward a sting nor toward a burst of rose-color. The structural line is long and firm; it is never broken by a moral timidity in the guiding hand. As a result the stories have the radiance of perfect cleanliness, like the radiance of burnished glass. The style has not yet been burned quite clean. There are still patches of magazine English—unvisualized similes, pulpy adjectives. But Miss Cather knows exactly the effect she is after, spare yet imaginative, sensuous yet cool. And at times, as in the young painter's vision through the magic knot-hole in his wall, she achieves it completely.

The theme of her stories is the life of art, specifically of music. Or, rather, it is the life of art as contrast, criticism, symbol, refuge, as the one imaginable escape for an American from ugliness to beauty, from bondage to freedom. Among the earlier stories here gathered Paul's Escape strikes a key-note of the artistic soul's escape from Pittsburg into a brief light and then into death, since death is a nobler consummation than such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a murder of a soul by a Nebraska village as is described in A Wagner Matinee. In the later stories the protagonists have made their escape: fully and magnificently and with a fine pagan flourish and melancholy, too, in Coming, Aphrodite; partially in The Diamond Mine, since Columbus does break down and corrupt the life of Cressida Garnet in the end; with a touch of conscious defiance through which the chain still clanks a little in A Gold Slipper, with its superb embodiment of the adversary, the Philistine, the righteous man in the beefy soul and furtive dreams and final poverty of Marshal McKann. The debate between him and Kitty Ayrshire in the Pullman car is a triumphant statement of the book's central thought—an American debate between the body and the soul, in which the soul is not yet wholly liberated but still feels as though heavy earth were strewn upon its wings. Thus Miss Cather's book is more than a random collection of excellent tales. It constitutes as a whole one of the truest as well as, in a sober and earnest sense, one of the most poetical interpretations of American life that we possess.

The stories of M. Clemenceau are quite perfect. Only one has the distinct feeling that one has read them all before, not once but many times. With sure, rapid, effective strokes he sketches a landscape, a situation, a character. An illustrative anecdote is next told in the manner of an admirable but very calculating *raconteur*, and this anecdote culminates in a bitter, disillusioned little point. The anecdotes deal mainly with the life of the French provinces—with peasants and curés and country-doctors. And here M. Clemenceau was, of course, on his own ground. But in the middle of the book is a group of stories dealing with Galician Jews about whom M. Clemenceau knows nothing at first hand—obviously and literally nothing—and yet these stories are told with the same bright air of worldly assurance and the same technical dexterity as the others. And so one begins to suspect, as, indeed, one has long suspected on other and similar occasions, that this particular form of French art has become as highly and tightly conventionalized as, let us say, the management of the heroic couplet had once become in England, and that any competent man of letters can use it for an hundred subjects without touching one of them and reveal in the process nothing but his own skill. A personal element that "dates" the stories is M. Clemenceau's anti-clericalism and positivism; you are left in no doubt that his mind crystalized in the sixties of the last century. Yet the stories, if not put to the test of inner veracity, are thoroughly readable, and are extraordinary by-products of a life so long and vigorously dedicated to less innocent pursuits.

The technique of Yiddish literature is, quite naturally, akin to that of the Russians. It is, like the Russian, a realistic literature and a literature of pain. Its realism is not a method but a necessity. Suffering and need strip life. When such life expresses itself, the expression is simple and poignant. It has no time for moods of studied synthesis. Art is secondary; form merges into substance. That is true of the great mass of Yiddish short stories, which are singularly free from the meretricious; it is true of these stories by "Shalom Aleichem" concerning the children of villages in the old Russian pale and their teachers in the *cheder* or Hebrew school where the law and the Talmud are taught. The life described is cramped and dusty, but not without vivid gleams of beauty—swift, shy contracts with nature, the poetry of ritual and tradition. But perhaps the best quality of these stories is their humor, and such characters as Isshur the Beadle and Boaz the Teacher do, indeed, allowing for less breadth and vigor, justify the comparison of Rabinowitz with Dickens that has been made.

ALFRED · A · KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

YOUTH AND THE BRIGHT MEDUSA *By Willa Cather*

THERE seems to be no disputing the fact that Miss Cather is our greatest living woman novelist. In the stories in the present volume she deals with youth's adventures with the many-colored Medusa of art. Each tale is marked by the amazing ardor and restless energy of imagination which is peculiarly hers; by a quick, bold cutting into the tissues of human experience and emotion that makes each of them a new discovery about character and life. $2.25.

THE CONTROL OF IDEALS

By H. B. Van Wesep

This book aims to teach us how to "laugh a little at our own ideals and hold them no less dear." It is written in the spirit of a Nietzsche shorn of his madness but not bereft of his insight. The author is a research worker in philanthropic problems at the Rockefeller Foundation and his manuscript was read and recommended for publication by the head of the department of philosophy in a great university, an eminent authority on politics and government and an intelligent layman. $2.00.

Floyd Dell's First Novel

MOON-CALF

will be published October 25th

It is unquestionably the most important American first novel that we have ever received.

It is advisable to place your order now with your bookseller before advancing costs force a raise in the price. $2.25.

THE CONFESSIONS OF JACOB BOEHME

The note-book of "The Father of Theosophy," author of *Six Theosophic Points*, in which he describes his spiritual development. Here is to be found the inspiration and the starting point of German theosophy, the inter-reaction of Platonian philosophy and Christian dogma which paved the way for the Reformation. A work of profound and permanent interest. With an introduction by Evelyn Underhill. $2.00

HAGAR'S HOARD

By George Kibbe Turner

The scene of this tale of an old man's greed and a young man's love, is Memphis during the yellow fever epidemic of 1878. Mr. Turner excels in vivid characterization and sureness of touch, and he has, in this novel, created a really distinguished piece of work. $2.25.

MLLE. DE MAUPIN

By Théophile Gautier

The third in the series of handsome reprints of French classics with introductions by Burton Rascoe which Mr. Knopf instituted last year. This book is uniform with *Madame Bovary* and *Manon Lescaut*. Printed on Warren's India Tint Olde Style paper; bound in black buckram with gold stamping and gilt top. $4.00.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

THERE is much entertainment in J. Walker McSpadden's eleven "Famous Detective Stories" (Crowell). Emile Gaboriau and Maurice Le Blanc, as here represented, are wordier than the Anglo-Saxons; Robert Louis Stevenson's story has a knightly ring that the others lack; Anna Katherine Green, with her woman detective, strangely impinges upon the purple of sentimental melodrama; Sax Rohmer and Thomas W. Hanshew for the English and Arthur B. Reeve and Broughton Brandenburg for the Americans solve mysteries by mechanics or pseudscience; E. W. Hornung, father of Raffles, protests against the invariable triumph of the detective in the average story; Conan Doyle suffers from the many imitators who have used his tricks. Yet in spite of these minor differences, what seems most striking is the fidelity with which all these authors have followed the formulas of Poe. Instead of inventing the form did he discover something inherent in the structure of the detective tale? Must all detectives have mediocre companions through whose consciousness the narrative can be reported up to the moment when the lightning strikes and the master reveals what has not been guessed by the stupider companion—and the readers? Are the motives and methods of crime, under all the surface disguises, capable of being reduced to such simple formulas? One thing is certain, the detective story, entertaining as it may be, is the most thoroughly standardized product in modern literature, as bright and hard and competent as a jack-knife, and hardly one iota more humane.

Drama

Triflers and Playwrights

IT is commonly supposed that the French theatrical hack surpasses his American colleague in technical dexterity and in the specific sense of the theater. There was a time, undoubtedly, when this supposition squared with the facts. Today we have a dozen writers for the stage as coldly and knowingly efficient as Kistemaeckers and Bernstein themselves. The difference between the two groups is one that concerns substance not form, the materials and not the methods of playmaking. The Frenchman may distort and pervert the passions; the American avoids them. The former approaches a single situation from an hundred roads; the latter flees from it by as many. Thus the one is apt to be monotonous and violent, the other empty and trivial. A natural consequence of this contrast is that when a single French play comes to us in the midst of a throng of native products, it seems far less ignoble and far closer to the central preoccupations of life than it really is.

The immediate situation on our stage illustrates that contrast with a hard and brilliant light. Five new American plays surround a single French one. They are all well enough built; each selects and sustains its note with sufficient skill; all are false and vacuous to a degree that lifts the isolated French play into an unmerited luster and turns its brass to gold. Mr. Porter Emerson Browne's "The Bad Man" (Comedy Theater) does, indeed, contain the human triangle of the French tradition. But the American bosom is appeased by making the husband an unspeakable villain and having him promptly and conveniently killed. Similarly the figure of the Mexican bandit, acted with both massiveness and grace by Holbrook Blinn, was conceived in an ironic mood. A satire on the superman of melodrama was attempted. But Mr. Browne took fright and let the action roar to an accustomed end. Mr. Belasco gives a velvety production of "Call the Doctor" (Empire Theater) by Miss Jean Archibald, who has a neat little gift for epigram. Her human situation, unhappily, omits the fundamental elements that must have created it and holds the soothing assurance that disillusioned husbands can be turned into ardent ones by a display of silk hosiery and the noise of jazz. "Genius and the Crowd" (George M. Cohan Theater) portrays the struggle of an Italian violin virtuoso of twenty-three to be "pure and clean," and depends on a wilted picturesqueness flavored by speeches in the best style of the once popular *Family Herald*. Miss Rida Johnson Young's "Little Old New York" (Plymouth Theater) sketches the city of 1810 with the depth and imaginative grasp of a newspaper headline and tells the story of a romantic inheritance and an Irish lass masquerading as a boy. The audience dutifully laughs at the distrust with which Cornelius Vanderbilt regards John Jacob Astor's speculations in the marsh lands around Gramercy Pond, and is quite properly pleased by the pale, quaint sweetness of Miss Genevieve Tobin in trousers and an Eton jacket. A final depth is reached by Mr. Booth Tarkington in "Poldekin" (Park Theater). This play, calculated to save America from the fury of the Reds, neatly combines—granting its own initial attitude and purpose—the economics of a boarding-school miss, the intellectual grasp and detachment of a baseball "fan," and the patriotism of a Polyanna. No respectable man of letters on the Continent would permit himself to sink to a comparable depth of fatuity. He might be specious; he would not be "glad." He might display the rancor of a man, not the feeble petulance of an ill-bred child. It is characteristic of our theater that so able an actor as Mr. George Arliss consents to take the title role in this play and in the midst of its dreary imbecilities gives a performance of delicately spiritual iridescence and admirably silken strength and glow.

From these productions you go to see "The Woman of Bronze" (Frazee Theater) by Henri Kistemaeckers and you cannot avoid the impression that you have passed from wax-work cabinets to a room filled with people, from the glitter of spangles into the sunlight and the dusk of earth, from the chatter of cheap pretenses to the vicissitudes that stir our hearts. Not that Kistemaeckers is a good dramatist or his play a good play. It is hectic, strained, theatrical. But these American playwrights have not, alas, reached the level on which he is an inferior artist. Thanksgiving turkeys of *papier-maché* from the candy shop are not bad poultry; a doll house is not a bad house; "Poldekin" is not a bad play but a bad joke. In "The Woman of Bronze" a sculptor who is married to a devoted and sympathetic wife of his own age, falls in love with a young girl. They succumb to their desire, and, since the girl is to be a mother, he leaves his home with her. But the two are not happy together, their child dies, and the man returns to seek the forgiveness of his wife. It is a conventional plot, falsely isolated, falsely over-emphatic. He who has watched the world with a sense for its essential tragedies is not inordinately impressed by the importance assigned to this merely possessive sex passion, either, as in America, by furtive silence or, as in France, by loud display. The endings of such plays must, he knows, be artificial, since within the circle or these voracious passions there is no solution either in art or life. Not until the characters, like those of Schnitzler, accept but also transcend their passions and treat their own ardors with detachment can a note of reconciliation be sounded. But such things as Kistemaeckers describes do, at least, happen; the stories of his American contemporaries never happen at all.

Miss Margaret Anglin takes the part of the sculptor's wife and reveals herself as clearly our most eminent actress. She melts into her part and blends it with the ardor, the beauty, the profound experience of her own soul. The figure she thus projects upon the stage is of a reality so haunting and so moving in its utter freedom from all but the hour and its impassioned business that the cheeks tingle and the heart throbs. She offers us that absorption in an artistic vision which is forgetfulness and liberation and joy. She makes an unworthy play worthy of herself and leaves with the spectator an enduring memory of her genius and her power.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The British Labor Delegation to Russia

THE British Labor Delegation to investigate conditions in Soviet Russia has submitted its report, dated July, 1920. The text of the report follows, with the omission, due to limitations of space, of one or two short passages.

The British Labor Delegation to Russia was sent out by the Labor Party and the Trades Union Congress, acting on a resolution passed by a special Trades Union Congress on December 10, 1919. This resolution demanded:

"The right to an independent and impartial inquiry into the industrial, political, and economic conditions in Russia."

The delegation consisted of nine persons—seven men and two women—and they were accompanied by two delegates (men) from the British Independent Labor Party. Correspondents of newspapers were also with the party, but did not accompany them in all of their investigations.

The British Foreign Office, when applied to for permission to go to Russia, referred the question to the consideration of the Council of Three then sitting at San Remo, and obtained their consent to issue passports to proceed to Esthonia or Finland for the purpose of entering Russia—the latter country, however, not being mentioned. The Soviet Foreign Office, through M. Litvinov at Copenhagen, telegraphed a prompt and cordial acceptance of the proposed visit, and the delegation left England on April 27 and crossed the Russian-Esthonian frontier on May 10, arriving at Petrograd on the following day. On the evening of May 16, the delegation left Petrograd for Moscow, where they arrived the following noon, and remained in Moscow until the 28th, when they traveled to Nijni Novgorod and embarked on the Bielinski for the voyage down the Volga to Saratov. At Saratov the majority of the party returned to Moscow, but certain members (owing to the illness of one of their number) remained on board and proceeded as far as Astrakhan on the Caspian Sea, and returned by ship to Saratov. The party who returned first to Moscow, visited the Polish front near Smolensk.

The shortest period any member of the party was in Russia was about three weeks; the majority of the members were there for about six weeks; and one remained longer to study peasant questions in the Samara Government.

Conditions of Inquiry

During their visit to Russia the delegation saw and talked with the chief members of the Government, with influential workers in the Soviet and in the trade unions, with propagandists and educationists, and with members of political parties opposing the Communists. Numerous institutions were visited including factories, workshops, Soviet stores, cooperative societies, schools, and hospitals. Theaters were visited both in Petrograd and Moscow; numerous meetings were addressed; receptions and dinners were attended; great parades of troops were reviewed in Petrograd and Moscow, and the army seen at work at the front at Smolensk. In addition to this, numerous private persons were interviewed. The delegates generally had freedom of movement and inquiry, and were able to make individual investigations; they feel assured that they were able to see a substantially normal sample of Russian life. Both town and country were seen. Throughout the visit the delegation were received everywhere by the civic and trade union authorities with military guards of honor, with bands playing the Internationale, during which all stood at the salute, and by a very real and genuine popular interest and welcome from peasants and workers. . . .

We feel it necessary to begin by pointing out that most accounts of Soviet Russia which we had seen in the capitalist press of our own country proved to be perversions of the facts. The whole impression gained was of a different character from that presented by these accounts. We did not see any violence or disorder in the streets, though we walked about them freely at all hours of the day and night. We did not see people fall dead of starvation in the streets. We did not see any interference with the religious life of the people. We did not see any Chinese soldiers. We saw no evidence of extraordinary luxury on the part of the leading Commissars. We did not find that either women or children had been nationalized. We certainly did witness a widespread breakdown in the transport system with deplorable economic consequences, and we saw terrible evidences of underfeeding and suffering. These points have been dealt with, however, in the reports already issued by the delegation on the iniquitous policy of intervention and blockade.

General Conditions: Food and Clothing

The first thing to which the attention of the delegation was directed on entering Russia was the question of public order and the conditions of the people—their individual physical condition, their clothing, the conditions of their daily life and work, the houses they lived in, the appearance of their children. Our first impressions in these respects were confirmed throughout our stay.

With regard to public order there is very little to choose between one side of the Russian frontier and another. In both, peasants till the fields, men work on the railway line, and little crowds are to be seen on platforms of stations as the train goes through. In Russia, however, there are evident signs of illness and underfeeding to be seen in most crowds that one looks at. But children look better than adults. The official estimate supplied to the delegation by Dr. Semasko, People's Commissar for Public Health, was that in the towns in January of this year only 50 per cent of the food required was supplied. The clothing of most people is very shabby indeed; quite ragged clothing is often seen, and boots and shoes are very bad. Very few boots, indeed, are not obviously patched and repatched, many are past this repair, while the ordinary Russian footwear of bark or felt looks very defective when much worn. At all Russian stations soldiers—mostly dressed in faded khaki-like uniforms—were conspicuous, as well as railway officials in their old uniforms.

There is no doubt that the average Russian in the towns is underfed, badly clothed, and badly shod. Peasants, however, are much better off, and those we saw were sufficiently fed. Ailing and sick children are seen only rarely. On the average, children are better off than adults in Russia. The standard of nutrition of children, however, is not good judged by western standards, children seen at a good open-air "colony" school on the outskirts of Petrograd, for instance, having the general standard of nutrition of London children in an average poor district. The Russian Child Saving League estimate that a child receives only enough food for eighteen or nineteen days in each month—roughly about two-thirds of the supply needed. Few town children over one year receive milk unless purchased specially at open market rates, which are quite out of reach of the average working man or woman. The deficiencies in diet are above all in quantity, and then in milk, fats, green vegetables, and albuminous foods.

Housing

Most Russian houses, except in the large towns, are of wood, and in the villages often house a very large number of inmates. The houses seen in the villages were of fairly good type, but the general sanitary conditions remain "exceedingly bad."* There is no acute shortage of houses in the villages, and during the last year there has been an increase in the amount of new building. In the towns "the sanitary conditions of houses are exceedingly unsatisfactory,"* but with the requisition of all private houses and the new distribution of housing accommodation among the population the evils of overcrowding are now less. There is ample accommodation in Petrograd, the population of which is reduced from an estimate of about 2,000,000 to about 800,000; but Moscow is overcrowded. The lack of fuel

*Report of Commissar of Public Health.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for warming houses in Moscow and Petrograd has resulted in the destruction by frost of water and sanitary pipes on a large scale, and the water carriage of sewage is consequently in abeyance in a large proportion of all buildings.

Industrial and Political Life

Turning now to the general conditions of industrial and political life, there can be no question of the sweeping character of the Russian Revolution. It has effected in the towns of Russia not only a change of political power, but a social transformation. The richer classes have been dispossessed of their houses and other property; the control of large scale industry has passed out of the hands of those who were formerly at the head of it. Large masses of the town population are now enjoying a share of the available national wealth (including house accommodation) greater than they enjoyed before; and new possibilities of life and culture are opening out before them; and this is true in a very special degree of the child population.

Social equalization is, indeed, far from complete. There are certain classes which do better than others, e. g., the soldiers, those doing specially heavy manual work, and so-called "responsible workers" in the central government departments; persons who are making money by speculation, i. e., private dealing of any kind, but especially the sale of "controlled" articles illegally at market prices; and persons who are still able to sell valuable property which they possessed before the Revolution. Large numbers obtain special privileges, and some make fortunes. But when all is said, the material advantages enjoyed by the "new bourgeoisie" over and above the rest of the population are extremely small when compared with the advantages enjoyed by the propertied classes in every capitalist country. Broadly speaking, a single standard of living has been established. The glaring inequalities of fortune which form so great a scandal in capitalist countries and which are maintained even in distressed countries such as Austria and Poland; the striking difference in economic position between the rich and the poor—these things no longer exist in Russia.

This equalization applies to education and entertainment as well as to food, housing, and clothing. Opportunities of education are now open in the towns to large numbers of children and adults, from the elementary stages up to the university. In connection with the theater, music, painting, and sculpture, sports and physical development, means of pleasure and cultivation have been given to the workers on a scale unknown in earlier days. The greater part of the tickets in the principal theaters which formerly the poor never dreamed of entering are now allotted to the various trade unions for distribution to their members at low fixed prices.

We have been much struck by the enlightened policy of the Soviet Government in the matter of child life. It has consciously adopted, and is practically enforcing, the principle to which lip service has so often been rendered, that at any given time the life of the rising generation is of greater moment to the state than the lives of the adult population, and that consequently the children's claim upon all the physical and intellectual resources of the state must be satisfied before any other. The utilization of the houses of the rich for "children's colonies" (which take the place of the elementary schools during the summer) is one of the most striking illustrations of this principle.

Great efforts have been made for the economic reconstruction of the country, which is a matter of life and death for Russia. The Red army, before the recent Polish attack, had been partially transformed into a labor army, and arrangements had been made for mobilizing civilian labor for works of immediate necessity; large new transport and electrification schemes had been initiated. Voluntary and unpaid labor on Saturday afternoons for purposes of reconstruction (the *Subbotnik*, as it is called), carried out, it is true, mainly by Communists, and partly to be regarded as a means of educating the public, has become one of the regular features of town life. The idea of the duty of all citizens to take part in reconstructive work for the state is being inculcated to a degree unknown elsewhere. A great campaign of popular propaganda has been inaugurated for this purpose, by means of the press, posters, notices, and "propaganda trains."

These achievements of the Soviet Government represent, we are aware, only one side of the picture, but as Socialists we feel that they should be emphasized at the outset. We must state, on the other hand, our conviction that these achievements have been bought at a very heavy price. We allude not merely to the violence which accompanied the Revolution, the exact extent of which we have not investigated, but to the methods of government which are still believed by the dominant party to be necessary. We leave open, for the present, the question as to whether these methods were or were not "inevitable." We confine ourselves simply to the state of affairs which exists.

Personal freedom, together with freedom of speech and of propaganda (including newspapers, the issue of election literature, and the holding of meetings), is severely repressed in the case of all those whose activities are supposed to threaten the Soviet regime. The means now used are far less severe than those used when foreign invasion, civil war, and internal conspiracy were at their height—"the Terror," as they are called by Communists themselves. But "the Terror" has left its traces behind it, in the form of a pervading fear which is expressed on all hands, a fear sometimes more vague and sometimes more definite, that any expression of opinion adverse to the dominant party will be treated as "counter-revolutionary," and will lead to imprisonment or some kind of penalization. This fear is kept alive by the fact that arrests constantly take place for alleged political offenses. The definition of such offenses is dangerously wide, closely resembling, in fact, the definitions adopted in our own Defense of the Realm Act, and the numerous Orders made under it. The fear above alluded to is evoked especially by the Extraordinary Commission, a body independent of the ordinary courts, acting upon no definite code of law, and controlled by a "collegium" consisting of members of the Communist Party.

The main reason given for these methods of government is the dangerous situation created by foreign attacks, and the maintenance and encouragement of internal conspiracy by foreign agents. An overwhelmingly "strong" government is thought to be necessary, because the mass of the people, though passively supporting the Soviet Government, are not yet sufficiently "conscious" to be immune from counter-revolutionary influences.

All possible means are used to secure the dominance of the Communist Party in the elections to Soviets. The actual congresses of Soviets are large and unwieldy bodies, and the power tends to be concentrated in the hands of executive committees and præsidiums. Elections become less frequent and more formal, and the party aims by means of organized groups at controlling every department and every institution of the national life.

The dominance of the Communist Party is not only accepted in practice, but defended as something which, though not in the written constitution, is an essential part of the working of Soviet institutions under the present transitory conditions. The right of bearing arms, possessed by members of the party, is based on this idea. The counterpart is to be found in the onerous and dangerous obligations which attach to membership.

The report of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party, held on March 29 to April 4, 1920, is concerned with state policy in its widest significance, and gives decisions which members of the delegation have seen already carried into effect in Russia in June, 1920.

The second paragraph of the report of the Ninth Communist Congress deals with "The Question of Organization" and lays it down that "it is the business of the party to explain to every one of its members that at the present moment when the Russian Communist Party is responsible for the economic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life of the country, the most inconspicuous and roughest work in the economic sphere is one of the greatest importance, and is to be considered responsible party work." The sentence quoted is typical of the finer side of the Communist Party attitude to what they consider their duties and responsibilities.

Another matter to which attention must be drawn is that centralization and government control are on the increase in other departments of life than those already mentioned.

Labor-power is dealt with more and more on disciplinary principles. The trade unions are increasingly controlled by centralized "Councils of Trade Unions," which are more amenable to the influence of the Supreme Council of National Economy. The cooperative movement, instead of being an institution for self-help on the part of certain sections of the community, has become a definite part of the state machinery.

As to the country population of Russia, it has not been won over to socialism, or to anything more than a passive acceptance of the Soviet regime. The peasants are supporters of the Revolution, on the ground that it has placed the great estates in their hands. But the nationalization or socialization of the land has not been achieved except in name. Communistic methods of agriculture are being introduced here and there, but have made little headway.

The methods of rule and government as here outlined are severely criticized by the Social Revolutionaries, by the Mensheviks, and by Prince Kropotkin in the memorandum he has submitted.

It now remains to consider how the Government of Russia is tackling the practical problems of its foreign relations, and of its own plan of internal reconstruction.

Foreign Policy and Militarism

The British Labor Delegation has already unanimously recorded its emphatic opinion of the criminal folly of the policy of intervention, non-recognition, and blockade hitherto pursued by our own and other governments of the Entente group. In this declaration we have called attention to the danger of the militarization of Russia.

The Allied policy which has made this militarization not only necessary but inevitable from the standpoint of the Government of Russia defending itself against attack from without has also pushed Russia in the direction of expansion towards Persia and the East. When questioned on that aspect of Russian policy the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, M. Chicherin, said that if England and France attacked them (through Poland or otherwise) "their hands were free in the East."

The danger of the creation of a Russian militarist spirit, bitterly hostile to this country, is a real one, for which we have to thank the governments of Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Millerand. We are of opinion, however, that the Russian Government, while hoping for social revolution elsewhere, does not intend to attempt to carry this out by force of its armies, and that it will be possible to make a durable peace with it on a basis of mutual non-intervention in internal affairs. We consider that it has rendered, by its publications of the secret treaties, a great service to democratic and open diplomacy. By its repeated offers to negotiate on reasonable terms it has shown a genuine will to peace. It has shown in particular every disposition to make peace with the border states in the west (Finland and Poland). Arrangements have been concluded already with Georgia, Latvia, Esthonia, and Lithuania, the Republic of Azerbaijan has entered into a federative alliance with Russia, and the status and relationship of a Far Eastern Republic, stretching from a line east of Lake Baikal to the coast of the China Sea, is now being discussed in Moscow. The Russian Government has thus shown that it has renounced the imperialist policy of Czarist Russia, and is ready to deal with the difficult problem of nationalities on a basis of justice. It should be realized that whatever the theoretical views of certain Communist leaders may be on the desirability of a world revolution, the practical administrative problems which confront them are of such a nature as to demand the last ounce of their energy, and the last fraction of their organizing capacity.

The Land and the Peasants

The most important and urgent of Russia's practical problems is that of the productivity of the land, and the relationship of the town and the peasant populations.

The total population of Russia and Siberia within its present frontiers is estimated at 125,000,000, of whom at least 90,000,000 are peasants. While the towns are preponderant in political power, they are dependent for their food on the peasants. At present the peasants support, or at least do not oppose, the Bolshevik Government for at least two reasons: (1) the revolution has given them more land, which they wish to keep; and (2) their experience of the rule of Denikin, Kolchak, and other counter-revolutionaries has made them see that Bolshevik rule is less severe.

By decree all land is nationalized, and in practice the large estates have been expropriated and the holdings of the richer peasants broken up. The "Squire's Land" in the villages, and undeveloped land, has been added to the poorer peasants' holdings. When the delegation interviewed M. Sereda, Commissar for Agriculture, he stated that as long as the peasant works his land he holds it, and while the right of inheritance is stated not to exist, the question of the use of the land in case of death is settled by the peasants of the village; and while land cannot be sold or willed away, "if the family undertake to work the land, then there will be no interference with them."

The practical difficulties of getting supplies from the peasants are evidently very great and similar to those existent all over Europe at the present time. According to Russian law, corn [grain] has to be delivered to the Government on payment of certain very low fixed prices, but it is the intention of the Government to pay not in money but in kind. At present, however, there is little which can be given in exchange, and the peasant is consequently resistant, as paper money is worth very little and he cannot obtain the manufactured goods which he needs. Nevertheless, the amount of corn [grain] collected is increasing. M. Lenin, in an interview, stated that the amount had risen as follows:

1918	30,000,000 poods*
1919	110,000,000 poods
1920 (to May)	175,000,000 poods

M. Sereda pointed out the difficulties of his department as follows:

1. Fall in production due to lack of manures, lack of machinery, deterioration of stock, lowered physique of workers due to lack of proper food. The decrease in productivity is estimated at 30 per cent to 40 per cent.

2. Want of technical experts, e. g., 35,000 land surveyors are required, and they have only 4,000.

Nevertheless, M. Sereda stated that the policy of developing state farms and encouraging the agricultural communes and artels (different types of cooperative farms) in every way was being carried out. In 1918, there were 242 cooperative farms, in November, 1919, there were 6,366, the areas being 23,509 and 650,000 dessiatins† respectively. The farms employed in 1918 32,199 persons, and 1919, 420,904 persons. Certain so-called "Soviet" farms are being worked to supply individual factories.

M. Sereda pointed out the importance of Russia to the world by giving certain figures of supply for Russia:

	Proportion for Russia
World's supply of cereals	79 per cent
Rye	48 " "
Hemp and Flax	70 " "

M. Sereda considered that the transition from individual farming to socialized agriculture could only come about by

*A pood is equivalent to 36 pounds avoirdupois.—Editor.
† A dessiatin is equivalent to 2.7 acres.—Editor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peaceful voluntary cooperation and not by violence, and that consent would have to be won by studying the psychology of the people. German agricultural experts were coming to assist them, and they desired the delegation to extend a similar invitation to English agricultural experts also.

As well as the corn [grain] which the peasants deliver to the Government, they are also called on to sell other products up to a fixed proportion and at a fixed price. Above this proportion private trade in agricultural products is allowed, and in the market at Moscow milk, potatoes, green vegetables, carrots, eggs, pork, and other foods were on sale. Bread was obtainable also at 400 rubles the pound, a very large increase on the ration price of two rubles. The great discrepancy between the fixed government prices and the open market prices is a cause of great dissatisfaction to the peasants, and an incitement to illicit trade.

For a long time to come, it is clear that Russia must be dependent for its food supply on arrangements made with what in practice is a population of peasant proprietors. In spite of great efforts, including the use of force where methods of persuasion fail, the necessary amount of food is not obtained, as the food statistics show. Nor are things likely to improve in this respect, unless the Government are able to pay something more than paper, which by the tremendous inflation of the currency become every day less and less valuable. An English pound changed at the Commissariat of Finance realized 4,800 rubles, while the price in the open market was 10,000 or over. And it is remarkable that at this higher rate of exchange prices were roughly comparable with those in Western Europe. But with the inflation of the currency the value of the ruble drops, and prices rise.

The peasant is allowed and expected to feed himself and his family, also his stock, off his land before giving up any product to the Government, and except in districts like the Nijni Novgorod Government, he is enabled to do so. Before the Government makes its demands, an allowance is made for depreciation of productivity due to absence of manures, machinery, and also for seed. Most peasants seen were sufficiently fed; but their clothing and boots were deplorable, and all were in need of agricultural implements and machinery.

Nationalization of Industry

The large industries of Russia, the coal, iron, gold, and platinum mines, the petroleum wells, the locomotive and machine works, metal industries generally, the textile industry, the railways, larger shipping, and some smaller industries such as salt and cement have been nationalized. Some smaller industries, such as the Trezor works at Petrograd making army equipment, and shipping up to 30 horse-power on the Volga, have been left in private hands. But despite a big program of reconstruction the blockade and the fight against Kolchak, Denikin, and the other counter-revolutionary forces have prevented anything more than the effort to maintain industry. The retail shops have also been nationalized, and so has banking. In the case of the shops, this has led in practice to the closing of shops, but not to the stoppage of retail trade. Banking, on the other hand, is being converted into a central bookkeeping department of the state. The production of the country is being dealt with according to an "Economic Plan" largely under the direction of the Supreme Council of National Economy.

M. Milutin, the assistant of the Commissar in this department (M. Rekov), explained to the delegation that "while the war is on we cannot extend industry, we can only maintain it." The economic plan of the development of Russia is based upon a very comprehensive survey of the need of the country, but is governed in its practical application by two main factors: (1) the restrictions on external trade, and (2) the Polish offensive.

The economic plan contemplates fifty productive departments, a financial department, and a department to coordinate the work of local economic councils which exist in different towns, in the different governments, and in larger areas (*oblasts*) embracing more than one government. Each department is controlled by a director or a collegium of three or five members, and the whole of the Supreme Economic Council is controlled by a præsidium of eleven members nominated by the Central Executive Committee of the Trade Unions, and confirmed by the Council of People's Commissars.

The functions of the Supreme Economic Council are: (1) industry; (2) the financing of industry and the parceling of raw materials. There are 5,000 nationalized enterprises, of which 2,500 are grouped into 179 trusts and directed by the Council itself; 70 per cent of these enterprises are working. Twenty-five hundred enterprises are managed by local economic councils forming part of the provincial organization, but directly responsible to the Supreme Economic Council. The Supreme Economic Council has the power of veto over the members proposed for appointment to the local economic councils. Food, fuel, raw material of industry and transport, and material for education are all supplied by the Supreme Council of National Economy. In the case of bread, for instance, a special commission representing the Food Commissariat, the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, and the Supreme Economic Council fixes the amounts of food for different categories of workers, and then distributes the bread available according to the reported population of each district. The work of the Council is thus highly centralized; and M. Milutin explained that in connection with the nationalization of industry "the main line of policy is to establish centralized organizations."

The difficulties of the transition period from the condition of chaos which existed at the beginning of the revolutionary period to the present day, are well exemplified in the Report of Two Years' Dictatorship in the Metal Industry of Petrograd by M. N. J. Antonov, President of the Metal Section of the Council of National Economy of Petrograd. The trade unions of Russia have all grown up within the last few years, and their members in consequence have not had a training in administrative and practical affairs like the trade unions in this country. In February, 1917, there were only three trade unions in Russia with a membership of 1,385. At the beginning of the revolution some workers broke up the machinery with hammers, and took pieces home to their own houses; in the majority of workshops and factories the technical staff managers, engineers, and clerks were thought to be hostile to the revolution and were turned out. The further revolution compelled the originally independent factory committees and trade unions to coalesce, the factory committees remaining the local organ of workers' control. Later on control passed to a bureau organized by the metal trades section of the Economic Council. Still later factory administration collegiums were organized, consisting two-thirds of representatives of the Council of National Economy, and one-third of factory workers. These collegiums have now been replaced (Ninth Communist Congress Report) by one-man management.

Various methods have been tried to stimulate production which had fallen to "almost a catastrophe" owing to (1) the want of qualified workers and technicians; (2) weak labor discipline of the workmen; and (3) the abolition of piece-work.

In the reintroduction of the system of piece-work in 1919, a more ambitious program of work was attempted (January-June, 1919), and the production was increased. Sea transports, river steamers, submarines, torpedo boats, barges, and trawlers were made or repaired; 23 locomotives made and 41 repaired, as well as 466 wagons [railway cars] made and 3,313 repaired.

The difficulties of the situation were complicated by the Judenich attack on Petrograd. The difference between estimate and accomplishment is shown below:

	ESTIMATE	ACHIEVEMENT
Fuel (in poods)	1,225,806	81,758
Workmen (employed)	36,286	14,670
Wages (in rubles)	106,593,000	114,191,000

In 1919 the metal industries of Petrograd district were grouped into seven trusts, viz., motor-cars (eight factories),

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aeroplanes (eight factories), medium-sized machinery (eight factories), copper industry (four metal works), heavy machine industry, mass fabrication trust (eight factories), and apparatus of precision and clock trust (thirteen factories and shops).

Only in May, 1920, however, was an inventory of metal and metal wares begun. The Metal Section looks forward to the creation of a "socialistic economy" when improvement in the fuel situation takes place after the war.

Much the same story can be told of the textile mills and also of other less important organizations. Coal getting operations are just beginning in the Don basin; and the reconquest of the Caspian Sea gives access to the oil of Baku which is being sent up the River Volga in increasing quantity, vivifying the shipping and the industry on the banks of that mighty highway of Russia's economic life.

Members of the delegation saw how the life at Astrakhan and its fishing industry was becoming busy and active, and how the salt industry at Vladimirovka had restarted (June, 1920) with the arrival of the naphtha of Baku. But while the war continues all attention needs to be concentrated upon it, and the economic rebuilding of Russia has to be deferred.

The Cooperative Movement

The great change in the organization of the cooperative societies (already referred to) took place in April, 1920, and the chairman (M. Lejava) is already (interview, June 2, 1920) able to look forward to the handing over of the functions of the Food Commissariat to the Central Organization of the Cooperative (the Centrosoius). At present the Centrosoius controls both certain productive enterprises and distribution. All citizens of whatever class are members of cooperative societies. The workers are being educated in the principles of cooperation as laid down by Robert Owen. In its dealings with commodities, the Centrosoius carries out the orders of the Supreme Economic Council with regard to the distribution of state monopolized articles, and works according to the tariffs and categories laid down. The monopolized articles are wheat, bread, coal, sugar, textiles, fur, clothing, and timber. Other goods are not monopolized, but the Centrosoius, while working here as a voluntary organization, adopts in practice the general economic plan as a guide and distributes goods according to the need for efficient workers, and not according to capacity for payment.

The Centrosoius has a representative on the Supreme Economic Council, and the chairman has the right to attend meetings of the People's Commissars although without power to vote.

Labor

All matters directly affecting labor are the concern of the Commissariat of Labor, which is governed by a Commissar and a board of two others, all of whom are nominated by the Central Executive Committee of the Trade Unions and appointed by the Council of People's Commissars.* There are about 500 local departments in different districts and governments. The departments of the Commissariat are: 1. Registration and Distribution of Labor; 2. Fixing of Rates of Wages; 3. Protection of Labor; 4. Statistics; 5. Museum of Labor; with subsidiary departments dealing with finance, organization, and internal arrangement of the Commissariat.

Labor exchanges, of which there are 420 with 260 branches, are now part of the labor department of the state, and they distribute labor for all purposes. Wages and hours of labor are fixed in accordance with the economic conditions of the country, and in practice this is done by the Central Executive Committee of the Trade Unions. During the war it has been necessary to allow the employment of children and young persons; but it is hoped to withdraw all persons up to 16 years of age from industry at an early date. Overtime is encouraged in factories and workshops, and double employment is undertaken. Children of 16 are not allowed to work more than six hours a day. All hours over eight are paid as overtime, and the workshop votes on the number of hours to be worked overtime. Women work the same hours as men, but for eight weeks before and eight weeks after confinement they are excused from work and receive full pay.

An average wage for a normal month's work varies from 1,200 to 4,500 rubles according to skill. Those out of work receive the total unskilled wages, whether they are skilled or unskilled, plus dinners and ration card entitling them to purchase goods at fixed prices. Those unemployed must accept suitable work if offered, under penalty of forfeiting their pay. Specialists and technicians receive very much higher rates of pay. At the present time there can be very little unemployment in Russia, although exact figures are lacking. The difficulty is to prevent men leaving the factories and workshops and going to the country. Membership of trade unions is compulsory, and embraces all persons without exception engaged in an industry or institution. A trade union in a factory includes technical staff, clerks, engineers, skilled and unskilled workers. A trade union in a hospital includes orderlies, charwomen, stokers, dispensers, nurses, clerks, and doctors. Labor is also compulsory for all able-bodied men and women of eighteen years and over up to fifty.

The difficulties of the situation were seen by the delegation in the ragged and half-starved condition of the workers at Sormova and Putilov works. They were drawn forcible attention to by a worker from the Kolomna works, who stated that desertions from the works were frequent, and that deserters were arrested by soldiers and brought from the villages. The workers at Kolomna were stated to receive about 4,000 rubles a month or 48,000 a year, while the living of an ordinary peasant reckoned at ordinary market prices was valued at three and a half million rubles a year. Also, the peasants are willing to employ men at much higher money wages than they can get in the factories and workshops, plus a plentiful supply of food, which the town worker does not get.

M. Karl Radek, secretary of the Third International, says to the workers: "No surprise is entertained at your having fled to the villages to escape starvation, but the entire country is doomed to ruin and famine unless you return to town."

The direction in which interesting developments of trade union activity may occur is seen in the account of the visit paid to Chatura Electricity Works, where peat is used as a source of power. Here the workers, who are peasants, and who work only two and a half months a year, are paid much higher wages than usual, the money wage amounting to from 15,000 to 20,000 rubles a month plus a substantial payment in kind of very good rations. One hundred and five people here had handled 70,000,000 poods of peat, while at another works working on the normal system and at normal rates of pay, 283 people had only handled 6,000,000 poods. Another interesting experiment is at Kazan, and is being carried out by members of the building trade union who had been given 2,500 acres of land and had undertaken to develop a community; they were working directly under the Supreme Council of National Economy. Eleven hundred and fifty people are employed, and the community has its own communal kitchen, its own schools and library, and *crèches* for the young children. The productive departments of the colony are a carpenter's shop, a tin-plate shop, an engine-shop, a flour mill, and a railway with an engine of its own. This community is undoubtedly far more favorably situated than the ordinary workers of Moscow or Petrograd, and their life cannot be compared with the stress and strain of the normal lot. Amongst other advantages, it enjoys that of being in the country and being able to grow its own food. The rations of the community were distinctly good. Work along these community lines appears to be in the line of natural development of the Russian workers' psychology, which, in work, always expressed itself before the revolution in the artel. (A primitive method of cooperation.) Another interesting exp riment is that of the Russian-American tool shop, created

*Interview with M. Schmidt, Commissar for Labor.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Moscow by seventy men deported from the United States, a large number of whom, of course, spoke English, and who had had experience of American organization of industry. The men were working twelve hours a day and had a premium system by which it was possible for a worker to earn 100 to 200 per cent more than the rate. A special laundry and cook-house was attached to the shop, and all the workers, men and women, got not only dinner but supper.

The communist view of the trade unions is expressed in the report of the interview with M. Schmidt already given, and in "The Trade Unions in Soviet Russia," by A. Losovsky (Moscow, April, 1920). The present defects of organization are recognized, particularly the impossibility of carrying out completely the proposed "system of the state regulation of wages," but it has one very great virtue, "it is the child and creature of the Revolution." (p. 46.) It is stated that "there is not a branch of state activity (military, food, sanitary, economic, technical, cultural, etc.) in which the Russian trade unions are not engaged." "Revolutionary activity, whole-hearted loyalty to the cause of the Revolution, the clear and firm position in the struggle with the bourgeoisie, the stern and ruthless hostility to the very idea of the cooperation of classes, the fearless destruction of old relations and fetishes, are things which the Russian trade unions may teach the workers of other countries." The critics of the present form of trade union point out the need for "independent class organization" in opposition to the tendency of government policy being framed to suit the preponderant mass of the peasants. Also, that the need of Russia for foreign capital, and "the adaptation of Russian private capital" with the "extreme growth of private small and home industry" creates now "numbers of hired workers standing in need of defense of their interests by the trade unions." Another reason for the maintenance of independent unions is to resist "compulsory" measures and "bureaucratization" by the Soviet authorities, and they must be able "to defend before the Government the interests of the proletariat, independently of the views of the Government itself." The critics look to improvement in wages, reform of the loans system, freedom of election of boards of administration and works committees, and political reforms to secure greater freedom generally.

Women and the Family

The considerations that apply to the labor of men in Russia apply also generally to that of women. But special legislation aims to secure a period of relief from work at full pay for eight weeks before and eight weeks after a confinement, and nursing mothers up to one year from the birth of their children are supplied with extra rations and exemption from certain kinds of work. How far these excellent prescriptions are carried out in practice the delegation do not feel able to say.

All able-bodied women in Russia are now expected to work, and it is important to remember that in old Russia the women of the working classes habitually went out to work and, as a rule, left their children locked up in their rooms. Now they can dispose of their children in four ways: (1) By looking after the children themselves; (2) By sending them only to the mid-day meal at the children's dining-rooms; (3) By sending them to kindergartens or *crèches*, where they are taken care of the whole of the day; (4) By placing them in the children's communities, where they are looked after, fed, clothed, and housed by the Soviets.

The theory of the Communist Party that every soul must give a labor contribution to the community carries with it the implication that the individual must be freed from the economic burden of the family. Both men and women are paid on a basis of individual wage. The state, therefore, must come forward and provide for the economic needs of the child; it is the concern not only of parents, but of every adult citizen to see that all the children are well cared for; and through the public purse all contribute to their upkeep.

It is impossible at this stage to express an opinion upon the effects of this great change in the economic relationship of parents and children. We are of the opinion that while it will undoubtedly modify the lives of children in the towns, it will not make much impression upon the great mass of the children spread over the peasant population.

There are very few, if any, sex barriers to work in Soviet Russia; the majority of teachers are women, as in Great Britain; about half the doctors are women also, and women are found in every department of life. Women serve in the army, and some are officers. The head of the police of Petrograd is Madame Ravich, and she has all the men as well as a large staff of women under her. The heads of the Child Welfare departments of Petrograd and Moscow are both women. Women also are elected to the Soviets and take part in trade union work, although in small numbers. Women are especially enlisted by the Medical Department to help in the sanitary and cleanliness work of the local Soviets.

Communist Party Women's Department

The Communist Party has organized a women's department. In structure, it is like our women's section of the Labor Party. It has its committee working in conjunction with the Central Committee of the party, and it has its sections in connection with every branch and every district throughout the country.

The function of the Women's Department is to develop women for administrative work, to educate them in all branches of the Government's activities. They organize the mothers of the children to attend *crèches* and children's dining-rooms. They prepare rotas so that one or two mothers are in attendance in the dining-rooms to see that the staff perform their duties adequately. They hold meetings to discuss all political and economic questions, as well as matters relating to health. Innessa Armand (known as Innessa), the head of this department in Moscow, was especially emphatic about the question of prostitution. The old regime left a very large heritage of prostitution. It has not yet disappeared, although the change in the economic system is hastening its disappearance. There is a great deal of venereal disease, however. Innessa Armand stated that there is no longer the economic incentive to prostitution. They try to make the old prostitutes engage in useful work and by educational methods they are preventing the making of new prostitutes. Girls of sixteen start work and are expected to work at least six hours a day.

The state has abolished all distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children. They have now a system of registration of births of all children. The father's name is always registered as well as that of the mother. There is now no attempt on the part of the father to conceal parentage. In old Russia there was no civil marriage, only the church marriage, and a very large number of people lived together without marriage. They called this agreement to live together a "Civil Contract," but there was no registration. Now, while it is still true that some people live together without marriage, as a rule they prefer to be legally married. Divorce is by mutual consent, and if one party disagrees or objects a delay of three months is imposed. The department has not yet had time to establish the necessary statistical machinery, but it was given as a considered opinion by Innessa that the relationship between parents and children, when not depending upon an economic tie, is more likely to depend upon the bond of love. The story that women are "nationalized" in Russia is a stupid libel without foundation in fact.

Transport

A matter of importance as grave as that of agriculture to the country as a whole, is the question of the transport of commodities from one part of Russia and Siberia to another. Food may be abundant in Siberia, but Petrograd will starve if the trains and steamers do not go. The importance of this problem is emphasized strongly in the Report of the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party. And while the delegation was in Russia they were enabled to see the progress which is being made.

The operations of the army at the Polish front are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supported by an adequate railway system. Trains are running from Petrograd to Moscow, and Moscow to Nijni Novgorod, to Saratov, to Vladikavkaz, and Baku. The railway to Siberia is open, and used for military purposes. Members of the delegation themselves traveled from the Esthonian frontier to Nijni Novgorod and voyaged down the Volga from Nijni Novgorod to Astrakhan. A large part of the journey was in company with M. B. M. Sverdlov, the Acting Minister of Ways and Communications, who is himself largely responsible for the improvement of transport, and an enthusiastic advocate of one-man management and personal responsibility. The transport system is improving, many routes of trade have been repaired after destruction caused by war, and many bridges rebuilt and repaired. The program of railway reconstruction laid down for accomplishment has not only been carried out, but its achievement exceeded. At least 4,000 locomotives are now working in Russia, and they will reach 6,000 before long. Wagons exist already in considerable numbers, and many evidences of repair work were seen en route in sidings and at stations passed in traveling. The discipline of the transport service is severe; fines, imprisonment, and curtailment of privileges are inflicted for many offenses, and drunkenness on the railway on the part of an official (alcohol is, of course, prohibited throughout Russia) is punished with death by shooting. Being parts of the lines of communication, men in the railway service are deemed of equal importance with members of the Red army, and have to undergo military discipline and receive rations on the same scale as the Red army.

The reconquest of the Caspian Sea has made the oil of Baku available for river and railway service, and opened up communication with Turkestan and with Persia. There is little doubt that in the near future a substantial improvement in the situation will be registered.

Public Health

A matter which fails to be considered apart from other questions, although of fundamental importance, is that of public health. Health conditions in Russia are very bad, and are only mitigated by the unflagging work of the doctors and sanitary personnel. Since 1918 the country has been swept by great epidemics of typhus, of recurrent fever, of Spanish influenza, and of cholera, while local outbreaks of smallpox and other diseases have occurred. The Russian Commissariat for Public Health states that a typhus epidemic broke out in the autumn of 1918 and lasted until the summer of 1919, the number of cases registered during eight months being 1,299,262, with a death-rate of from 8 to 10 per cent. This is presumably independent of an epidemic of recurrent fever at the same time. As registration is difficult in Russia, the total number of cases is probably much greater, as in the villages and country districts numerous persons must have escaped observation. The epidemic was universal, and practically no town or village in Russia escaped the infection. An unfortunate feature of the epidemic was the high mortality of doctors; about 50 per cent of doctors in attendance on patients in hospitals actually succumbed to the disease. The effect of the shortage of doctors so produced has been lamentable, and at the time when Astrakhan was visited there was only one doctor for the whole of the area of the Astrakhan Government outside of the town itself. Typhus in Astrakhan Government had actually killed 14 per cent of the total number of doctors in the provinces.

The measures taken against the spread of typhus, the great distributing agents of which are the railway lines, have been the controlling of traffic, and the establishment of control stations at fixed points on the line, and at important junctions. A sanitary campaign, in which women have been largely enlisted, has been carried out in many towns and villages. Severe measures are taken against culpably dirty people, and baths are called "Dr. Semasko's Extraordinary Commission." The effect of this campaign is shown in the figures for typhus cases of all-Russia (including Siberia) for the present year, which are as follows:

February	389,859	civilians
March	313,624	"
April	158,308	"
January	66,113	army
February	75,978	"
March	57,251	"
April	16,505	"

The rise of army cases in February, 1920, coincides with the retreat of Denikin and reinfection from his troops. But great as the efforts of the medical staff have been, even elementary disinfection has, as a rule, been impossible. In hospitals visited in Moscow, and in towns and villages on the Volga there was no soap available for washing floors or bedding or patients' clothing. The only disinfectant available in most cases was formalin, and that only in small quantities. As a rule, it was impossible to do more than tidy and sweep hospitals, and wash them with water without soap. Some hospitals visited were as clean as could be expected, others were dirty and even dangerously dirty. Home disinfection of the houses from which infectious cases were brought was impossible as a rule, and was only attempted in Petrograd (the Sanitary Brigade for Disinfection work is here under the command of Dr. Havkin) and Moscow; in the country towns and villages it was not carried out. Nor was it possible to disinfect the clothing of the patients themselves. In 1918 there was also a cholera epidemic reaching the figure of 35,619 cases, and on June 14, 1920, there were 100 cholera cases in Moscow, and the menace of a new epidemic. There were only a small number of cases in the summer of 1919. Smallpox exists in Russia very widely disseminated, and 81,851 cases were registered from November 1, 1918, to July, 1919. At the time of the visit of the delegation to Russia it was personally ascertained that there were cases in Petrograd, in Moscow, and in Astrakhan. Much vaccination was carried out.

A severe epidemic of Spanish influenza also swept over the country in 1918. What the total mortality from these diseases has been, it is very difficult to estimate; but at the very lowest the mortality from typhus fever alone must amount to two or three hundred thousand. A large number of these deaths could have been prevented had it been possible to check the spread of the fever by cleanliness, by washing with soap, and by disinfection. Soap, however, is a commodity for which Russia is dependent on the outer world, as she is also for disinfectants. In the deprivation of these two prime necessities of public health the Allied policy of the blockade stands condemned as the cause of many thousands of deaths. When to the tale of typhus is added that of Spanish influenza, of cholera, of smallpox, and of other diseases, when it is realized that there are practically no drugs at all in Russia because of the blockade, that all hospital supplies are reduced to practically nothing, and that linen and blankets are lacking, the indictment of the blockade becomes blacker still. It should be realized that on the medical side of Russian life we are dealing with a question outside ordinary politics. Very few of the doctors are Communists, but they are Russians; they are as doctors professional humanitarians, they have worked to the utmost, as their starved faces and haunted eyes tell plainly, but destroy lice and disease germs without soap and disinfectants they cannot. And thousands of lives have been sacrificed for want of these elementary medical necessities.

Education

The Revolution in Russia has given a very great impetus to education, which had hardly begun in Russia before 1905, and which had progressed slowly up to 1917. The decrees on educational matters promulgated by the Government make all education free up to university grade, and it is also contemplated to supply free food and clothing to all young persons up to 16 years of age. A decree for the provision of maintenance up to 14 years of age was issued from the Commissariat of Education in July, 1919, and the decree extending the period to 16 at a later date. Progress has already been made in carrying the decrees into effect, and the Russian educational authorities estimate that 25 per cent of the child population are now in receipt

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a normal education of the elementary type. This is probably an over-estimate, as in some places visited accommodation for only 10 per cent of the children existed; and also there is no method of insuring compulsory attendance as in England, and children who do not wish to attend simply remain away. In some of the villages any education is of a very primitive description and confined to the winter months and to children between 8 and 13. It is estimated that 15 or 20 per cent of the children are receiving some form of effective elementary education. The difficulties are those familiar to educationists in this country: (*a*) want of teachers; (*b*) want of buildings suitable for school premises; (*c*) want of school furniture and of paper, pencils, books, and school apparatus.

Great efforts are being made, however, to meet these deficiencies. Special six-months' courses of training have been established for teachers; buildings taken over from the bourgeoisie are being adapted for schools, and arrangements are being made for import of necessary articles of furniture and equipment for school work. A campaign is being waged for the abolition of illiteracy; adult schools of an elementary nature for both men and women, and evening schools, are being created in increasing numbers. Special classes have been established in connection with the universities known as the Workers' Faculty, with a view to preparing working men and women for university study.

But in the matter of provision of food for children, the Russian education authorities have been more successful. In the villages this provision is not required, but in the towns there are special children's restaurants in addition to the arrangements for feeding at the schools. There is no doubt that as a result of these arrangements the feeding of children is on a more satisfactory basis than that af adults.

The delegation visited schools in Petrograd, Moscow, and in towns and villages on the Volga and found everywhere signs of the same general policy.

The Russian educational authorities are creating a large amount of boarding-school and open-air colony accommodation for children of school age, and a large number of *crèches* and kindergartens for children below school age. For the purposes of these schools expropriated houses in the towns and in the country are being used. Members of the delegation visited delightfully-situated schools in Petrograd and Moscow, and found that the children were being well and carefully looked after. Some of the schools were very well fitted up; others were more primitive. A small theater was a usual feature of all schools, as the educational authorities lay great stress on dancing, singing, and artistic self-expression. Children from the towns are transferred in large numbers to the country for the summer to special summer colonies, and several of these were visited. One, on the banks of the Moskva river, in an aforetime grand-ducal palace, was a very charming holiday home. The Soviet authorities estimate that they provide accommodation for 2,000,000 children in their boarding establishments and colonies.

An interesting feature of the schools was the attempt which is being made to link up ordinary education with the spirit of the workshop. The danger of education divorcing children from the proletarian atmosphere of factory and workshop life is being guarded against by special arrangements of the curriculum, to base it upon various forms of manual work. Religion is not allowed to be taught in the schools, nor are teachers allowed to take children to church, but there is no religious persecution, teachers and children individually are free to go to church if they wish. It is significant in this connection that in April permission was granted to the authorities of the Mosque at Petrograd to commence the chanting of the muezzins' call to prayer, which had been up to that time forbidden. Ikons and religious observances are noticed in schools, offices, and private houses, very widely spread. Lessons on socialism are given in the schools, and communism is taught definitely. Photographs of Karl Marx, Lenin, Trotzky, Lunacharsky, and others are frequently to be seen in the schools, as are also revolutionary mottoes.

In the schools visited by members of the delegation the children were free and happy, and many evidences were seen of the marked natural artistic ability which seems to be one of the characteristics of the Russian people. . . .

Conclusion

Such, as far as we have been able to ascertain them, are the facts in broad outline. Various questions of great importance naturally suggest themselves, e.g., whether the various measures taken by the Communist Party have or have not been necessary; whether the same results could have been brought about by milder means; whether any more democratic form of government could not be established; and lastly, whether the Russian Revolution ought to serve as a model to other countries, and if so, in what respect. These are questions on which opinions differ widely, and we do not propose to deal with them. We only desire to point out, as essential to the understanding of the Russian Revolution, the extraordinary conditions under which it has been and is being carried through.

Russia is a vast country, potentially rich, but economically in a backward state. Her people consisted, before the Revolution, of peasant owners (the vast majority), a town proletariat, a small bourgeoisie, and a still smaller class of large capitalists, sharply distinguished from the rest of the population. Russian party strife has been marked by its extreme violence. The present leaders are men who have suffered every kind of oppression, and have been accustomed for years to take their lives in their hands.

With such conditions and such a history, Russia has been plunged into no less than six years of continuous and still continuing warfare. She has been blockaded and her communications with the outside world cut off. She has been invaded by foreign troops on all sides. More important still, the most desperate efforts have been made to foster conspiracy and civil war on her territory.

The economic collapse, and the measures for the restriction of liberty, are due at least as much to these causes, and the general exhaustion, suspicion, and despair which they would have produced in any case, as to the tumults and mutual hatreds to which the Revolution itself has given rise.

Whether, under such conditions, Russia could be governed in a different way—whether, in particular, the ordinary processes of democracy could be expected to work—is a question on which we do not feel ourselves competent to pronounce. All we know is that no practical alternative, except a virtual return to autocracy, has been suggested to us; that a "strong" government is the only type of government which Russia has yet known; that the opponents of the Soviet Government when they were in power in 1917 exercised repression against the Communists.

Such are the conditions and peculiarities, the heated and revolutionary atmosphere, which must be taken into account in any criticism of the Russian Revolution, and still more in any attempt to apply its lessons to other countries.

The Russian Revolution has not had a fair chance. We cannot say whether, in normal conditions, this particular socialist experiment would have been a success or a failure. The conditions have been such as would have rendered the task of social transformation extraordinarily difficult, whoever had attempted it and whatever had been the means adopted. We cannot forget that the responsibility for these conditions resulting from foreign interference rests not upon the revolutionaries of Russia, but upon the capitalist governments of other countries, including our own.

Ben Turner, The Labor Party, Chairman of Delegation
Margaret Bondfield, A. A. Purcell, H. Skinner, Trades Union Congress
Ethel Snowden, Tom Shaw, Robert Williams, The Labor Party
Chas. Roden Buxton, L. Haden Guest, Joint Secretaries

The report has been submitted to and also indorsed by Mr. R. C. Wallhead and Mr. Clifford Allen, who formed an independent delegation to Russia on behalf of the Independent Labor Party.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED